

AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. XXIX.

MARCH, 1834.

ART. I.—*Memoirs of the Court of Charles the First.* By
LUCY AIKIN. London, 1833.

THE destinies of the world are oftener dependent on men's characters—on their mere personal peculiarities—than is generally apparent. This is remarkably the case where the passions have assumed a particular direction, and every power tends with violent energy to extremes, and principles, whether well founded and long matured, or formed by the moment and for the moment, bend to the fury and rashness of exasperated feeling. The popularity of an individual, or his unpopularity, whether he be guided by the head or led by the heart; whether he be capricious or inflexible, conciliating or repulsive; whether there be those around him who counsel freely and wisely; or whether he be surrounded by secret enemies, or those worse than enemies, the cold-blooded, the prejudicial, the mysterious, the jesuitical and the cunning, may decide the fate of nations. Any of these peculiarities may at any time disturb events; and if there is ambition with meagre talents and small discretion, or ambition with great talents, and a clear, rapid discrimination, still the fall or elevation of empires is made to turn on a contingency, and that contingency, resting on the witless, irregular and absurd decisions of a feeble or a wayward intellect. Such is the unfortunate power exercised over men by those to whom fortune commits the care of human destinies, or by those whom chance may cast upon the current of actions. It is such as these the world calls great, while their career is the mere result of accident, and they have felt neither the influence of

mind, the turbulence of strong passions, which gives intensity to effort, nor the restless excited activity that rises naturally from the irritation of genius; and without these, what is the conduct, but drivelling imbecility—the sway, but fitful inconsistency? There must be strength to create an energetic control; there must be mind to multiply the sources of action; decision to adopt remedies for over-excitement, and stay the startling progress of events when once put in motion; and judgment to mould the faculties to the just accuracy necessity requires, and deter from the useless expenditure of exertion; and what man is there in history that meets this summing of the ingredients of greatness? We know of but one, Cromwell, and we have always considered him as greater than any of those disposed to tyranny and usurpation—than Bonaparte or Cæsar, or any other of the men who have been classed among “lucky scoundrels.”

He was ambitious, and his conduct was governed and directed by his ambition; he was a deep, crafty hypocrite, and his hypocrisy became at last a natural demeanour. His greatness may have been accident, and not derived from the impulse of strong passion, nor modified by elevated feeling, but the mere growth of chance; yet he was great in the results he effected, in the mental resources he displayed when the nation was sinking, beset by foreign power, and distracted by domestic factions. It is probable that he would never have attempted the ends at which he afterwards aimed, if they had not been dictated by circumstances, as his plans do not appear so much the product of vast conceptions, as the consequences of events. It may be with most or all of the men denominated great, that they can neither foresee nor calculate what may arise from affairs in which human nature takes an active part; but they have discernment enough to estimate means to adapt them to their ends, to bring remedies for an ill turn of fortune, and meet dangers they cannot anticipate or avert. Perhaps no man ever conceived more than a small portion of that which he has effected, or effected all that he has conceived. Energy of will and powers of mind are only elements of action, and not always sufficient for the intent of their labours. The presumption of untried strength may lead us to undertake more than can be executed; but Cromwell was endowed with a fine common sense, that first made him master, and then director of his own resources. His views were not extravagant or impracticable; they considered that which might happen, though they did not take in all that did happen. His imagination was not a restless stimulus to his intellect, nor had it any of the glowing ardour, the brilliant eras and passages that come in the ebb and flow of sensibility and feeling, nor comprehensive power to embrace the consideration of the downfall of the monarchy and the wielding of

his own sceptre. It brought nothing to his mind that was beyond its grasp; it did not allure him to the pursuit of novelty, to the expectation of strange incidents, which men, to whom fortune has come unexpectedly, love to conceive must appertain to the fulfilment of their destiny, nor did it unsettle the intellect from its concentration and loosen from its influence its own energies. He was the creature of circumstances and the creator of events.

Like all men who are born in times of action, he was in part the offspring of the feelings and opinions of the day; and like all men of powerful minds, and not inflexible principles, he seized on the circumstances that surrounded him, and used them to fix himself conspicuously in the scenes amid which he was cast. It is but seldom that the man who wishes power attempts to stem the direction of popular feeling; he does not encounter that which may sweep him from his object, nor obstruct the course that is buoying him with the hope of elevation. But Cromwell had always been attached to the popular party. It was in harmony with his impetuosity of character to assert disputed rights, with its morose and darker elements to defy royal supremacy, to detest regal splendour, and attempt to degrade the pomp and pageantry of a throne. His temperament was of the bilious sort—cool, cautious and slow in determination, steady and unflinching in resolution, and intensely rapid and energetic in execution, with perceptions alive to his interests, and a courage that bore him beyond every emergency; an ambition that never strove for mere victory, but always enlarged itself in the view of consequences; a judgment that never hazarded defeat, without relying on an increase of reputation. He chose the popular side, not because it was so, but that he knew, in all governments where liberty is acknowledged, the cause of the people is the only path to power; that whether repulsed and opposed, struggling or prostrate, it must at last inevitably triumph. But at that time there was every reason to favour his choice. England had advanced in wealth, her people in intelligence; the king was not distinguished for his qualities, and could never attract the love of his subjects. The designs of the crown were openly formed and pursued, and could be as freely resisted. There were no devices, no tricks of state to deter from the expression of opinion, no absolute power to make this dangerous; on the contrary, there was a stern and menacing determination among the British people to have a clear, fixed and lasting understanding of their privileges. It was the era and the season for patriotism, and nobly was it brought forth. In defiance of trial, difficulty and ruin, the advocates of freedom offered themselves for immolation;—but they designed, if possible, to rear their own altar, and not to be meek, submissive victims. They were willing that the king should officiate in their rites, but they would offer him no homage or worship, nor allow

themselves to be made a sacrifice at his will and to his authority.

The people had long been taught that they were only voluntary subjects; that their form of government was optional either to be supported or destroyed; and that the weight and dignity of the British crown reposed on the force and character of the British people. The king was such by sufferance, not by right; he swayed the sceptre, and wore the robe of power, only so long as he held the affections of his subjects. The old notions of divine right and passive obedience were now obsolete, and adhered to only by the parasites and minions of a court; by those whose energies were wasting in the vapid air of royalty, and mid the degradation of unmanly ceremony. It was not the age for the overweening admiration of individuals, the sneaking flattery that cringes to rank, but knows not how to bow to the plainer honours of virtue, nor how to appreciate the simple beauty of worth. There was a growing sense of freedom, a disgust at the assumption of unnecessary authority, an extreme dislike and jealousy of even the shadow of royal encroachments. But beyond all these new feelings was the overwhelming contempt with which were regarded things whose importance was derived, and to whom no other interest attached than that gathered from a worm-eaten antiquity, from the scrolls of past ages, the fading lineaments, dust and decay of time. To be rid of such a feeling as this, was to place a destroying hand on the institutions of the country; it was the death blow to all prescriptive rights, to those privileges that bore the sanction of tyrant custom, and which stood at a distance in a reserved and retiring dignity. It was to commence the laying bare the mystery of regal power, to unnerve the main strength of monarchy, by exposing its weakness and dependence to the curiosity of men, and by depriving it of the respect, the awe and admiration that men feel in looking on the loftiness of high station. It was a great step towards present anarchy, apparent ruin, but future glory. It tore off the shackles from men's spirits and allowed the aspirations of ambition, by bursting open the long concealed recesses of liberty. It gave an immediate eminence to mind by admitting talent to seek its own course, and offering the rewards of honour and reputation. It removed from men's hearts the incumbering sense of degradation which had belonged to a state of almost passive obedience, and made the subjects of the English crown feel that it was their country, not their king, they were to reverence; that it was the nation, not the man, whose name and renown they were to elevate.

It was at a moment like this, when the feelings were roused, and ready for rash endeavour, when the decision was taken to exclude the consideration of consequences, when old ideas were shaken and giving way before the assertion of those more vigorous and

better founded, when all was bowing, even the throne, to the shock of principles, that Cromwell appeared to determine in his own person the cause of kings. We do not admit that he was formed by the circumstances about him, but contend that he was brought out by them. He could never have played a subordinate part, when once he had chosen his career. Such men can only act in command; their force of character, like the whirlwind, is too blasting to permit equals to bar their passage; they can retire or remain in solitude, but when called to action, they cannot relax effort till it has borne them to the loftiest station, and to empire. He could live quietly under despotism, but, if near his master, must have been Richelieu or Sully—the tyrant of a tyrant, or the patriotic minister. He could not, like Cassius, be the calculating assassin, nor be led, like Brutus, by the dogmas of an elevated philosophy, to share in a murder which could only be unfortunate in result. He was too wise and considerate to plan any thing which would have been futile; too cool to hazard even in a good cause a loss which could not be retrieved, or throw away opportunity by hasty temerity or hurried exertion; too daring not to risk all to secure his ends, too indefatigable and too aspiring not to crush all opposition, or meet his own destruction. Such men are bounded only by extremes; when excited by events, they feel a power within, and a consciousness of strength which is only exhausted by their defeat and ruin. They love repose, as it is the natural state of power, and seldom awake to fitful starts of strength; but, when fully aroused, they never cease exertion till in possession of the object that has broke their slumber.

Of such elements was formed the man who was to control the destinies of his time, and form an era in the history of England. But Cromwell was not the only great man of his time, and perhaps was not the greatest man. There were others of as powerful intellect, and with understanding far more cultivated and enlarged by education: Many whose memories are still cherished by posterity, as representing not only the highest order of genius, but as honouring it by every virtue—as advocates of the noblest cause man has struggled for—as the victims in a cause that draws forth the finest feelings and the strongest faculties—and as men, whose revenge for persecution, misery, and death, is found in the admiration and immortality attached to their names. The secret of Cromwell's success does not lie in the immense extent and energy of his mind, but in his want of high sense of honour and moral principle. Like most men who aim at high destinies, he was little regardful of the means by which they were attained. He did not wish those about him to be incumbered with an acute moral sense. They were only to be tools, the agents in his designs, the sharers in the spoils of his power—but to sit at the footstool while he enjoyed the

throne. Before he closed his career, he discovered that he was but the instrument of instruments, and that the only force which can long be exerted over men, is the moral force of virtue; that the conduct of a ruler must be clear, explicit, and decided; the intentions such as are easily seen to lead to good ends, and such as are intelligible to those on whom they are to be executed, which can betray no wayward councils, nor suspicion of their character. Cromwell found that such a course in his situation was impossible. He was an usurper, and afflicted not only with the keen and biting edge of conscience, but with the more fearful misfortune of an obstructed ambition, which the events of every day were more and more steadily opposing, and turning to a severe and heavy disappointment. The men whom he had raised to rank deserted him when his designs obviously tended to the rearing a throne and establishing a dynasty. The creatures, whose life he had nurtured by his vigour, fell from him as soon as decay seemed to wither the source whence they gathered vitality. He had to encounter the envy of those who assisted in his elevation, and who conceived themselves his equals; the animosity of those who had been struck down by his sceptre, and compelled to bend to his dominion; the hatred of all who loved their country, and had mistaken the eagerness of his ambition for patriotism; and the malice of all who felt themselves blasted by the caustic exercise of his intellectual energy. He was the representative of a class, though not of the first order of minds, yet who administer and control most of the affairs of the world—men better fitted for the field than the closet, for the sword than the pen, for action rather than speculation. They appear at a crisis when a superior decision and firmness are required for the determination or commencement of revolutions, and seldom seem to mingle in the common course of business, so long as it is conducted without confusion and in mere routine. But if the progress of affairs is stayed or disturbed, they seem to issue forth ready for the most dangerous and violent contest.

Here we might venture a comparison between Cromwell and Washington; and in our opinion it would appear, the one was the greater genius, the other the greater man; the one better able to conceive and suggest sudden and daring plans, of whose results he was to be the sole arbiter, and reap the advantage; the other, more considerate in his hopes and less rapid in his decisions, and under the guidance of a more refined and lofty moral sense, and never wishing that which would have derogated from the model he had established for himself. The ambition of the one sometimes seems to sink to the vulgar love of power, and to be actuated by feelings centering in self; while the other never seems to have been governed by any other sentiment than patriotism, nor to have desired

any fame but that which would be honest as well as splendid. Cromwell was dazzled with his own deeds, as they were the unexpected product of fortune, and as he found his desires and his aims to rise with the elation of success. Washington had little self-confidence, and viewed his cause calmly, measuring the resources of the country, his own powers, the hazards and the consequences of his conduct, the disposition and the character of his countrymen. The former, apparently, was tempted to seize the crown that he had torn from royalty, and to bind once more together the fragments of the sceptre he had succeeded in breaking. The latter would have spurned a throne, as tarnishing in the proffer the lustre of a name to which no blot was fixed, and as a reward for services he had rendered as a duty, not with the expectation of recompense. Cromwell often descended to low arts to serve his purposes; to cajolery, flattery, buffoonery. Washington was seldom otherwise than the cold and polished marble, relying on the excellence of the cause to produce the enthusiasm necessary for success, and governing by the weight of his character, not by managing the passions of men. The one was emphatically the man of principle, the other the man of expedient. Yet one of the greatest and purest men of this time or any other, but who from his habits of life was little calculated to mark the shades and nice peculiarities of an artful and complicated character, thus speaks of Cromwell. "He, whom he couples with a name of scorn, hath done in a few years more eminent and remarkable deeds whereon to found nobility in his house, and perpetual renown to posterity," &c. "In the vigour and maturity of his life, which he passed in retirement, he was conspicuous for nothing more than for the strictness of his religious habits and the innocence of his life; and he had tacitly cherished in his breast that flame of piety which was afterwards to stand him in so much stead on the greatest occasions and in the most critical exigencies." "He was a soldier disciplined to perfection in the knowledge of himself. He had either extinguished, or by habit had learnt to subdue, the whole host of vain hopes, fears and passions, which infest the soul. He first acquired the government of himself, and over himself won the most signal victories. So that on the first day he took the field against the external enemy, he was a veteran in arms, consummately practised in the toils and exigencies of war." His extraordinary and supernatural virtue is then panegyricized, the vigour of his genius, &c., and a very noble and eloquent strain of eulogy is granted to him, as the saviour of his country and its liberties; a part of which may be party feeling, though perhaps true in all, save the high moral purity.

There was a more remarkable similarity between the sub-

ordinate actors in these scenes and those of our revolution, than between the two great leaders and agents in the cause. They were the same in all respects—in independence of feeling, in sturdiness of humour, and contempt for the gorgeous insignia of wealth, aristocracy, and royalty. They were the children of men who had ventured their lives and their fortunes for the sake of conscience; who had opposed with their whole souls the corrupt encroachments of arbitrary power, and its base infringement of their rights; who had opposed principle to prerogative, the noble energies of direct, upright, and serious feeling, to what may be considered the profligate daring of those who from ignorance, or the infatuated pride of station, seemed determined to trample on the bounds so firmly fixed and accurately assigned for the term of kingly dominion and the commencement of popular privileges. The worthies of the American revolution were hardly more than a generation distant from the fearful contest begun, on these grounds, by their ancestors. They were the immediate heirs of revolutionary opinions, and had, no doubt, imbibed almost at their birth a bitter hostility against crowns and mitres, the crushing influence of a sceptre, the swollen grandeur of a hierarchy. It was this that made them tremulous for liberty, jealous and wary of the insidious approach of oppression, and persevering when the sacrifice of all they had to render, from a duty became almost an absurdity, and the continuance of the struggle only seemed to hasten destruction. They possessed the same stern, rigid, and inflexible character, as those from whom they were descended, and they drew their swords for a cause they knew to be that of their country. Their religion was the same, and their religious scruples; and the resolve with which they entered battle, was not to seek glory, the brilliant illustration of fame, but a plain, pious determination to throw off every shackle, and fulfil every duty the emergency exacted; to give the honour of success not to their own valour, but to the justice of their cause, and the favour of heaven. It requires no great bound of fancy to transfer the principles, the sources of conduct, and almost the actions of the men of that era, to those of the latter time; to give to Hancock the soul of Hampden; to Samuel Adams that of John Pym, to enlighten Patrick Henry with the fire of Sir John Eliot, and with the genuine learning, pure honour, and lofty sentiments of Vane, to adorn the patriotism of some others who can meet the parallel.

Milton brings forward, and pathetically and beautifully apostrophises, Lambert, Fleetwood, Overton, Desborough, and regards them as men of splendid talents and devoted courage, to whom England and posterity are deeply indebted for the establishment of her liberties. But there were many equal to these. As the

mind of the country was in a stormy and tumultuous working, and latent talent, retiring through diffident merit, all the thought of the nation was called out and exerted. None were allowed to withhold their intellectual quota, to keep back their opinions, or retreat from their expression. It was a doubtful and dangerous crisis, a time of hazard and ruin, of dismay and despair. The path of future tranquillity lay through desolation; havoc and death were mingling a tide of blood. The fortunes and characters of men were staked upon a cast, and the whole scene carried to the view but a continued aspect of ghastliness and misery. Such was the situation into which Charles had thrown his country; but the declaration of its independence was yet to be given from a scaffold, and written in his blood.

We have conceived that it is not less necessary, and far more interesting, to know the personal character and history of men who have been distinguished in revolutions, who by their own energies have wrought great things, than to give a mere detail of events; and it may be asked, whom had Charles to oppose to such as we have enumerated? The king was of a feeble character, or rather too much so for the times. It would have been a strong one if the nation had joined in his opinions, and his part was merely to play the monarch; but with the current of things setting strongly against him, his chief characteristic, a pertinacious adherence to his own notions, became stupidity and madness. His strongest point thus turned to the weakest of all weaknesses—obstinacy; stubborn opiniativeness was the immediate source of utter and irremediable misfortunes. He had been bred, as probably most kings are, with a meaner idea of the value of being popular than of being powerful. He had a high conception of the throne, but not of the constitution; and forgot, or never learned till too late, that in a representative government the art of pleasing is more important than the art of governing, the mode of engaging the affections of the mass than those of a party. It is wrong to blame a man for a natural deficiency of understanding, or for any consequent dullness of perception; and it is still more difficult to accuse one of infamous conduct, even where there is talent, when the principles are grafted irrevocably by education, and the heart as well as the mind is made to feel the force of an indelible impression. We see every day men crushed by vice, who have never been led towards virtue, and the desolation of passions that have become instinct; it is therefore painful to charge with criminality of intention, those who are but pursuing what to them are the dictates of nature—the strong necessity, the inwrought impulse of feeling. We do not mean by these remarks to acquit Charles of the love as well as the desire for arbitrary rule, but to assert that they had been encouraged by

education, and that he was only acting up to principles, endeared to him by early association, and of which he could not know either the commencement or the end. If he had possessed the most powerful intellect, it might have been the same as to throwing off these trammels; for an inflexible grasp on preconceived opinion is a common characteristic with great men, and increases before the defiance and menaces of opposition. But the result might not have been the same, and the people of England, instead of tasting their sovereign's blood and their liberties at one and the same moment, must have waited for a more distant and favourable opportunity.

Charles, in common with his father, had one most unfortunate ingredient in his character—a facility of being controlled by and becoming strongly attached to favourites; and to this may be traced some of the most miserable disasters of his reign. He delivered himself and his affairs to the complete sway of that magnificent minion, the Duke of Buckingham. The insolent bearing, the extravagant expenditure, known to be dependant on the king's affection, and taken from his and the nation's treasure, his haughty temper, his tyrannical sway over his master, too great for a subject, his supercilious treatment of all, rendered him hateful to England, and the unpopularity engendered by these causes reflected on Charles. It involved them both in detestation; it originated a feeling of dislike, suspicion, and disgust, that was never palliated by subsequent conduct, and continued through the whole reign, even when there were evidences of a disposition to consult the happiness of the people, and conciliate their prejudices. James was too great a coward to resist the insolent spirit of Villiers; but the son was wilful, perverse, and brave; and as the duke was the favourite and master of two such opposite persons, he must have known how to lower his tone, and modify his disposition according to the circumstances and the characters with which he dealt. The king's letters to him are of the most familiar kind, and relate to his personal affairs, to his quarrels with the queen, and matters hardly fit for a subject's knowledge, and still less for his advice. The control this man had over Charles, shows that, with different counsellors, he would have met a different fate; but such guidance induced disgrace and ruin.

“Availing himself of the leading foibles of Charles's mind, excessive pride of station and despotic will, he led him to believe that it was for the interest of his own glory, to crush, by acts of power, the opposition audaciously aimed against the royal favourite; and thus carrying along his master with the momentum of his own impetuosity, he was enabled to subdue all his enemies, humble the whole court beneath his feet, disconcert an impeachment, break two parliaments, whose necks he could not bend, and plunge the nation into two unnecessary and injurious wars, the fruits of his own selfish intrigues or ungoverned passions.”

There were two other men who assisted essentially in deciding the fate of Charles—Strafford and Laud. Strafford was a man of eminent abilities, a lofty courage, and an ambition restless and unbounded, both in spirit and degree, but a tyrant at heart, and totally unfit for the times. At the outset of his career he was a violent advocate in the popular cause, and resisted, even to imprisonment, the illegal exactions of “tonnage and poundage.” But as his ambition was in no way connected with principle, his course was changed, and he became equally headlong and impetuous in the assertion of the king’s prerogative for the support of all his unconstitutional, arbitrary, daring, and absurd measures. It appears from “Welwood’s Memoirs,” “that there had been a long and intimate friendship between Mr. Pym and him, and they had gone hand and hand in every thing in the House of Commons. But when Sir Thomas Wentwood was upon making peace with the court, he sent to Pym to meet him alone at Greenwich, where he began in a set speech to sound Pym about the dangers they were like to run from the courses they were in; and what advantages they might have if they would but listen to some offers which would probably be made them from the court. Pym, understanding his drift, stopped him short with this expression—‘You need not use all this art to tell me that you have a mind to leave us; but remember what I tell you—you are going to be undone. But remember, that though you leave us now, I will not leave you while your head is upon your shoulders.’” The sturdy patriot fulfilled this appalling threat; he accused him in the House of Commons, impeached him in the House of Lords, and did not desert him till he had hunted him to the block. His execution has always been a source of accusation against Charles, and so far as historic evidence is decisive, no act of greater treachery, or weakness devoid of all excuse, was ever committed by a king, or illustrates more strongly the proverbial faithlessness of royalty. Though the court of the north, at which he presided, was armed with the fearful powers of fines, confiscations, and imprisonment, the levying of taxes at will, and to any amount, with many other constitutional privileges, and as Miss Aikin says—

“By these and other provisions, this awful tribunal was enabled to unite the powers of the court of chancery, the star chamber, and in effect of the high commission and ecclesiastical courts, likewise with the jurisdiction of the courts of common law; and this authority it might also exercise without the intervention of a jury, and with the substitution of discretionary punishments for those awarded by the laws—”

Yet the whole of this authority was placed in the hands of Strafford by the king, for his own purposes, namely, to crush his subjects; to demonstrate that he could reign without parliaments; that he, and he alone, had entire control over the

property and the liberties of the people of England, and that he was supreme arbiter of their destinies. It is of no consequence whether this power was agreeable to the temper and feelings of Strafford, or that it served his designs, or that it was treason to his country to administer such power; still it was the will of his sovereign. His government in Ireland seems to have been a continued system of tyrannical oppression, and all the charges brought against him on his trial may have been well founded, clearly and unequivocally established, yet all his conduct was either at the instance, or with the cognizance of Charles; and though it might have been an act of justice that he should suffer, of well-earned retribution to an injured nation that his life should answer for his misdeeds, still, base ingratitude will ever disgrace the memory of the king. It would have been better for him then to lose his crown, by declining to sign the warrant of execution, and thus embittering the furious hostility of the popular leaders, than to truckle to expediency at the expense of his honour. This unfortunate act clung to Charles to the last. It was accompanied by the feeling that he had sacrificed innocence, that the victim of the law was his instrument, and that it was little less than deliberate murder to throw on the mercy of enemies one who had followed his intentions, however offensive or criminal, with such earnestness and devotion of friendship. Charles should have remembered, that if the laws of the country had been outraged in the person of Strafford, it was the fear of his abilities which determined the House of Commons to his destruction. They dreaded the energy of his counsels, and his influence over the king, as much as they regarded the laws and constitution, or were disgusted with his prostitution. There is a letter quoted by Miss Aitkin, in which the king pledges himself to protect this devoted minister:

"The misfortune that is fallen upon you by the strange mistaking and conjuncture of these times, being such, that I must lay by the thought of employing you hereafter in my affairs, yet I cannot satisfy myself in honour or conscience, without assuring you, now in the midst of all your troubles, that upon the word of a king, you shall not suffer in life, honour, or fortune. This is but justice; and therefore a very mean reward from a master to so faithful and able a servant as you have showed yourself to be; yet it is as much I conceive the present times will permit, though none shall hinder me from being

"Your constant, faithful friend."

After this he sends for the Commons, to the House of Lords, and attempts to save the earl by yielding to some of the accusations against him:

"I desire to be rightly understood; I told you in my conscience I cannot condemn him of high treason; yet I cannot say I can clear him of misdemeanour; therefore I hope that you may find a way to satisfy justice and your own fears, and not to press upon my conscience. My Lords, I hope

you know what a tender thing conscience is ; yet I must declare unto you, that to satisfy my people I would do great matters. But in this of conscience, no fear, no respect whatsoever, shall ever make me go against it," &c.

The delicacy and the strength of his conscience were quickly tested. The bill of attainder passed both houses, and only required the assent of the king. A privy council was summoned to sit in judgment on the king's conscience, and the pledge of protection that he had offered, which involved the honour of one and the life of another. Strafford addressed a letter to the hesitating monarch, beseeching him to bow to circumstances, and pass the bill. Charles seized the opportunity, and gave the royal assent.

"On receiving the fatal, and as it appears, unexpected tidings, that his master had given him up, Strafford in some dismay asked again, whether it indeed was so; then rising from his seat, his eyes cast to Heaven and his hand upon his heart, he pointed himself the moral of his story by the text: 'Put not your trust in princes, nor in the sons of men, for in them there is no salvation.'"

Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, was a man of talents and learning, but the uncompromising representative of a party that asserted the supremacy of the church, almost, and perhaps at heart, totally above the civil power. Though too artful to express this feeling openly, yet it was confessed by his conduct, and had the immediate effect of bringing obloquy and hostility on the measures of government. The people of England at that time began to be very jealous of popery, and "papist, papist," was a cry that disaffected the hearts of all towards the unfortunate individual who had evoked it. The absurdity of such a denunciation within the precincts of a protestant establishment, and the dominion of a protestant king, was not questioned; it was enough if there appeared the least inclination to claim too much for the church, or to check the growing strength of sectarian opinions. Laud was a bold asserter of ecclesiastical pretensions, and, as it was his duty to be, though he carried it too far, a determined advocate for every privilege the church had ever held, and an equally determined foe to the slightest concession of any of her ancient rights, or to any compromise with those who did not acknowledge the legality, and even more than this, the divine right by which she ruled. This was certainly approaching catholic doctrines. And, coupled with the direct tendency of his conduct and that of the king, this gave to the nation room to believe that their liberties were submitted to the authority of a priest, and the power of an arbitrary monarch. Thence arose serious disaffection, which was increased by the counsels of the queen, a catholic, and of the rival kingdom of France, being supposed either to originate or strongly to support their measures. This state of irritable feeling extended

from suspicion to a fierce opposition, on the part of all who were not busy in forwarding their own interests by court patronage, who were not the parasites or the dependants of a hierarchy; and it was an irritated spirit which the inflexible pride and obstinacy of Charles, and the haughty domineering character of Laud, were in no way calculated to subdue. The nation were roused by what appeared to them a crisis in their affairs, and were emboldened to a more strenuous vindication of their rights, by the defiance with which they were treated by the king's counsellors, and by the torpor with which the sovereign seemed to neglect them.

There were other points of conduct with Laud, which tended to render him unpopular; his persecution of Abbot, and of some puritan fanatics, was a display of bitter feeling against a private enemy and of an influence in the affairs of government, which at that time was unfortunate and considered inconsistent with a mere spiritual control. But it is probable, that whatever he might have done, the hatred of his enemies would not have been lessened. He had created among the more important puritan leaders, a hostility against himself that never would have ceased while he had the power of injuring them, and this power was not only in his possession, but a will both fearless and active; it thus became a matter of self-defence with his opponents to resist and destroy, or to yield and be trampled on. One plea may be urged in his favour, that he acted only for the good of the church, and his actions, at any other time, would have been regarded as duties, not crimes; but when his adversaries afterwards became his masters, they threw the weight of decision upon posterity, by taking his life as an expiation for misconduct.

We have thus attempted to show, that no man could have been surrounded by worse or more dangerous counsellors, considering the age, than the king of England; not one appears to have had even a faint idea of the state of feeling in the country, and no one who approached him, seems even to have spoken with the warning voice of friendship, or exerted the influence which experience and wisdom might secure over a young and not badly disposed monarch. He was too easily led by those for whom he felt an attachment, and became too easily attached to men who used his passions for their own purposes, who aggravated his boyish desire of ruling alone, and who made him the martyr to the designs and interests of others. At the same time, it must be confessed, he was in no way fitted to contend with the turbulent spirit then rising through the kingdom, nor to oppose the difficulties or traverse the dangers that had descended to him with his crown.

It is both absurd and hazardous to offer any excuse for Charles

the First at this day; the current of opinion sets too strongly against monarchy and its attributes, to listen to any thing that bears the slightest appearance of an apology for the conduct of a king. But it is the duty of all who regard truth, to hear the evidence of history; and no one, whatever may be his sentiments, has a right to discard its impartiality for the purpose of fostering a prejudice. Facts should overbear feelings; and radical, republican or reformer, though he may utterly detest royalty, should be able to look on the unfortunate person, bedizened with its pageantry, as not altogether a monster. No one could have been more unhappily situated than Charles Stuart. Discontents had been growing in his kingdom through the reigns of his two predecessors. They had glanced but slightly towards the nature of the government, yet, with the usual restlessness of disaffection, were gradually extending from religion to the throne, from an examination of scruples of conscience to that of the rights of the subject and of the sovereign. It is the usual course, that activity of mind on any matter generally enlarges itself. It is in this way revolutions commence, and the spirit that accident or power might have destroyed, at length swells beyond resistance. James, and the more vigorous Elizabeth, had both found the disadvantages of a representative government to the designs of despotism. The commons of England made themselves felt; and the same people who had submitted, when the monarch was popular, began to display opposition when their yielding seemed to be thought a duty, and the control they had permitted from personal attachment, assumed the form of systematic tyranny. Whether they would ever have made the demands under James which they made under the son, is uncertain. They had shown the disposition, though this was never sufficiently matured to appear like a determination. It was this disposition which should have warned Charles, and those around him, of his danger. But it was neglected, and the slight vapour, that hardly obscured the transparency of the air, blackened at last to storm and fury. Fanaticism, under the guise of puritanism; a deadly hatred to the church of England, under the profession of hostility to the church of Rome; a spirit of liberty which, however pure in itself, decided on the destruction of the institutions of the country rather than be disappointed, were the main features of the time, and the obstacles with which Charles had to contend. We have shown that he was unfitted for such a purpose in every respect. It required one who knew how to yield absolutely or to feign concession; and by a haughty reserve, by pride, by obstinacy, Charles could do neither of these. But it is not by constitutional defects of temper he is to be judged. They may palliate, though not excuse, unconstitutional measures; but it is by his administra-

tion of the government, that posterity are to decide for or against him. There can be no doubt of the illegality of his exactions. Whatever may have been the purpose of the Commons in refusing supplies, it was still not only against the first principle of a representative form, that the people should pay taxes at the sole will of the executive, but the collecting them was a triumph over law and justice. There was a feeling prevalent at that time, which was so strong with Charles as probably to determine him to this course. A similar one existed at the commencement of the French revolution; and it must always exist, where a few are allowed to consider themselves as the nation. It was the feeling of feudal superiority, and that the nobility had rights independent of all control, while the people were only vassals. This was a source of discontent, though many of the nobles joined the popular cause, and relieved their order from the odium of being the enemies of liberal opinions. Still offices were given too exclusively to peers; they were exempted from pecuniary charges; the law was unequally applied in their favour; and the king, perhaps, showed too openly that he regarded them as the pillars of his authority.

These various feelings should have shown to Charles the improving state of his kingdom, and that even if hostile to his own views, they were still too deeply fixed to be neglected, opposed or eradicated. But his perceptions were obscured by his perversity, and he had not the sagacity to see that the most powerful minds were bent to the attainment of civil and religious liberty, and that the hearts of his subjects were becoming every day more and more filled with the hopes such excitement occasioned. All were gathering strength while he grew feebler, and was preparing the path for his adversaries. The clergy of the church of England, who feared for their establishment, when there is popular irritation, supported him. Two of them went so far in their doctrine of passive obedience, as to draw the jealous attention of the House of Commons. Mainwaring asserted, "that the king is not bound to observe the laws of the realm concerning the subject's rights and liberties, but that his royal will and command in imposing laws and taxes, though without the consent of Parliament, ought to be obeyed, at the hazard of eternal damnation; that those who refused to comply with this law, transgressed against the law of God, the king's supreme authority, and were guilty of impiety, disloyalty and rebellion; that the authority of Parliament is not necessary for the raising such supplies, &c." We have no doubt that these were the sentiments of the king, and of a large portion of his subjects. They expressed the antiquated doctrine, that lasted even to our own day, and which the potentates of Europe would wish were both common and justifiable even

now. It was one of the prevailing notions which the reformation undermined—the American and French revolutions destroyed; but it was so firmly fixed with the Stuart, that he saw neither its folly or danger, and determined to uphold it while he lived. He mistook this interested attachment to monarchy as dictated by God, and with Laud at his side to strengthen the feeling, it is not surprising, that he moved rapidly from error to error, and sunk faster and faster in the affections of his people. Puritanism was gaining ground in the universities, and some of the bishops had connived at it. But, like most religious schisms, it began to multiply itself, till the enmity of dissenters to each other became as bitter as their combined hatred to the established church.

From this branching of creeds grew a factious spirit; men who had laboured together as with one heart, for the preservation of the laws, began to regard the safety of their consciences. Political fanaticism grew from religious; the spirit of liberty, from its bold and open course, turned to cant and hypocrisy, and the salvation of the constitution, from the pure feeling with which it was first demanded, became mingled with the collateral object of the salvation of souls; patriotism degenerated to party spirit, and the designs of individuals seemed to rise triumphant over the welfare of the country. The constitution of England might, perhaps, have been regenerated without the revolution; but it required a strong arm to reduce the demands of parties to a condition consistent with the interest of the nation. Misgovernment had brought about the necessity of change, and at that time, and under such a king, a change implied revolution. He had opposed himself to his parliament, and when the law assumed its authority, his destruction was effected. The throne was overturned by a tyrannical prince, not an oppressed people; by the factious outrages of contending opinions, not by public sentiment. There was then but a faint feeling for liberty, and but a feeble intelligence on matters connected with the rights of the subject. The kings regarded their own will rather than the statute book, and the licentiousness of authority, with ignorance, consequent on feudal oppression, combined to keep down the demands of justice. However great the ends to be obtained by the removal of such evils, it is probable they might have been secured without a forced disclosure of the designs of fate, by a more gradual clearing, without anticipating time or compelling the immediate action of a great revolution. The struggle between prerogative and privilege might have been deferred till the understandings of men were as well prepared to comprehend the one as to claim the other; till their passions rose to a firm demand, but not to violent destruction.

The contest was between parties; for the sympathies of

the people were with the king. Those who arrayed themselves on the side of liberty, were the opponents of the church as well as the throne; and their desire of obtaining the first was not stronger than their hope of destroying the latter. They conceived that freedom of sentiment was impossible, under the united weight of a crown, an aristocracy, and an hierarchy; as they had not learnt that the bonds of this connection are loosened by degrees or by violence, on the approach of liberal opinions. Their co-existence is incompatible with the power of either. The last are ever attempting to elevate themselves, while the others strive to preserve their possessions, their privileges and empire unmoved. Liberty contains more of the principles of action than repose, while all establishments accumulate by time so much authority and the love of it, as to be tenacious in their grasp, and to part with any portion of it with great unwillingness; but the rigid tenets and severe principles of presbyterianism abhorred the magnificence, the ostentation, and haughty dominion of a titled order and an established church. They were prone to the simplicity of republicanism, and this inclination concealed a concentrated intensity of purpose, and an overbearing ambition, which in such men as Cromwell extended to a base hypocrisy, but at the same time was accompanied with a stern and unrelenting resolve to encounter all hazards in reaching the object. This object was not to break down the constitution, to behead the king, or to desolate the country. It was at first probably only a desire to secure more power to the commons of England, an indistinct hope of repressing that of the king, and opposing his encroachments; but never extending to the intention of an open resistance and civil war. The republican spirit, which afterwards became a revolutionary spirit, was the consequence of party divisions. It was the direct result of the suspicion of each other's views; the jealousy that each leader had of his opponent, and the desire to thwart him, rather than to assist in his elevation. It was the consequence of envy, and the determination that no one should rise on the downfall of the monarchy.

It is a remark of Madame de Stael, "in general in a country where there is no freedom, energy is found only with the factions." And this truth is the secret history of the destruction of most long established institutions. The habit of obedience not only conquers the desire, but does not admit the spirit of resistance. Servility becomes as instinctive as the servitude that produces it is fixed and strong. The crimes of the French revolution were occasioned by this habit being broken. Men who had been slaves, found themselves masters; those who had lain in stupor, lingered in the hopelessness, the spirit-broken indifference of despair, awoke at once to the stimulus and the fury

of passion. But in England there had always been a degree of freedom, though not so much as her constitution and her form of government authorized; and during the revolution of 1645 there was at no time an inveterate hostility among the people towards the throne or the peers. When the civil war began, the choice of sides was the consequence of decided opinions, not mere conceptions of the value of particular polities, or absurd notions derived from the visions and chimeras of heated fancies. Each party drew the sword in accordance with the design they had in view. It was a manly and an open contest, with a fixed purpose, but one that never could have arisen if all the advantages of the constitution had been realized, and there had been a freer vent for public sentiment. But England has seldom felt what in this country is the voice of the people. Her faulty representation has not admitted it, and the national voice passing through parliament has lost its force before it reached the king. He or his ministers have never known the hearts of his subjects. Delay has controlled violence, at length destroyed hope, and subdued feeling. There has been no concession, till compelled by the menace of revolution. The reform bill may remedy this condition, and winnow from the House of Commons the servile auxiliary of aristocracy, the creature of court corruption, and allow the wishes of the nation to receive attention before they turn to threats.

As the events of this era are familiar to the general reader, we have proceeded thus far without any express mention of the work of Miss Aikin. In the Preface it is asserted that she attempts "the history of the most remarkable period in the annals of Great Britain," and no one will decline assenting to this remark to its full extent. She has chosen a period the most dangerous for an author to illustrate; one that, notwithstanding both its actors and its actions have long since passed beneath the shadows of history, still leaves much feeling unallayed, much violent passion unsubdued, much deep-rooted prejudice as obdurate as ever. This state of things, however, which must last while England is a free country, and a full canvassing of the measures of government is not only permitted, but vitally essential; and while two parties, both patriotic, and with the interests of the nation at heart, stand ready to guard the institutions and check the undue encroachments of power, whether they proceed from the people, the aristocracy, or the throne. Preceding authors have taken the opportunity, in treating of these times, to make them the theme of invective against monarchy in general, or the king in particular, and to give the world not a history, but a party statement; a tirade setting forth their own opinions, and the inveteracy and ill humour of their own feelings. Whether we take Ralph the radical, Harris the re-

publican, May the Parliamentary historian, or Hume the advocate of the Stuarts, they will each be found tainted by a particular bias, and their accounts garbled and corrupted by a leaning towards certain opinions. Miss Aikin, though evidently liberal, is perfectly impartial; and what is rather singular, in the present state of England, appears to have made the choice of this portion of the British annals, unbiassed by her own sentiments, and to have gone through the labour as a problem might be demonstrated, where each step follows directly from its predecessor, and the result is made to speak for itself. It is a relief to turn from those who have published for a purpose, to one whose simplicity of style displays a confidence in her facts; whose design is to say no more than the truth; and who does not distemper details by attaching to them the bigotry of her peculiar thoughts, nor aim at the easily gained but quickly subsiding popularity, procured by writing for the violence and pandering to the virulence of party spirit.

It is a pleasure, keen and refreshing, to be presented with a view on which the mind may securely repose; after being jaundiced by malicious assertion, by ignorance, by superficial research, and treacherous misstatement, and in this way roused, in defiance of common sense and conscience, to choose a side, and carry with our choice, hatred and enmity towards our opponent. Such is the case from reading the histories of crimes, when there has been deep and tremendous excitement, and we are made to range through the dense array of the accusations of injustice and persecution, of invasion of rights, usurpation of authority, and all the other outrageous proceedings of the different factions, till our view closes in the desolation and misery of civil strife. But in this work of Miss Aikin, our feelings and our judgments go together, and both are allowed to take their natural course; we are irritated at the want of discernment and perversity of the king, but pity his misfortunes; we are indignant at the surly ferocity of his enemies, and their selfish designs, but are struck with admiration at their calm courage and undeviating perseverance. Charles is not represented, as has been often done, so that we must hate him, nor has he any quality but intrepidity, that makes him admirable. If there is any sense of dislike, it is against the Parliament, and more expressly against the man, who afterwards, possessing more than a throne, held more than regal power, and against the professing patriots who aided him in his unprincipled and atrocious intentions. It is this perfect impartiality on the part of the historian, the liberty we are conscious that we possess, to form our own decisions, the free reliance we feel on the statements and authenticity of the sources from which they are drawn, that render the *Memoirs of the Court of King Charles*

the First, a work of authority, and probably of lasting reputation.

But it is at the present moment of high importance, as giving the consequences of present events, and allowing us to infer the future condition of Great Britain, from scenes that are imbued with all the life and interest of the past. The spirit of democracy, which must arise in the spread of intelligence, and which makes all revolutions rather intellectual than political eras, is again bursting on the institutions of England, and preparing the way for their destruction. The ascendancy of this levelling spirit, though indeed prevalent throughout the world, is yet more marked, and more rapid in its work, where liberty and free discussion give flexibility to the principles and a vent to the strongest passions. The time appears approaching when England may once more assume the republican form, and from her insular condition, become the most powerful empire the world has seen. It was this fact which, during the protectorate, by precluding ambitious projects, and all designs of extending British dominions by continental conquest, made British prowess respected and dreaded. The energies of Cromwell elicited those of his countrymen, and there is no part of English history to which a Briton may refer with greater pride, than that of his sway; none to which foreign powers may look with greater fear, as displaying the force she can exert under that species of government. England cannot long exist in her present half revolutionized state, with a throne that has been shaken and compelled to yield to popular will—an aristocracy, dwindling before the weight and influence of the middle class and the intelligence of the lower—a church establishment, already attacked and no longer firmly fixed in the affections of the people—a House of Commons, that is the representative and instrument of the mass of the nation, and not as heretofore of the aristocracy, and which has already been overawed by the energy of the demands of the national voice. These considerations make the time occupied by Miss Aikin deeply interesting and instructive. The men most prominent in the drama she so vividly sketches, then solitary exceptions in knowledge, and far in advance of their age, are now represented by a large class. The mantle that hardly lay gracefully on Sydney and his companions, is now the common apparel with the larger portion of a great nation. Though England has gone through other revolutions since then, that epoch will remain as the first and most important change liberty and political reform have wrought in the character of her people. It was like the present, the age of principles; but their consequences, though beneficial, were at that time better portrayed in the words of the poet, which should be remembered by all who start great revolutions:—

The cease of majesty
Dies not alone; but, like a gulf, doth draw
What's near it with it; it is a massy wheel,
Fixed on the summit of the highest mount,
To whose huge spokes ten thousand lesser things
Are mortised and adjoined; which, when it falls,
Each small annexment, petty consequence,
Attends the boisterous train.

We have regarded the fate of Charles the First as the result of party spirit, or with more propriety, as the effect of the contest and collision between aspiring individuals. It is difficult at any time to decide as to the motives of men, or even to infer them from their conduct; but when time and partial history leave us the mere consequences of events, the ragged conclusions of things, it then becomes difficult to give any judgment, and painful to give a harsh one. But as a general rule, it is safer to take men as imperfect, and to conceive that passion will conquer principle whenever it is not directly and obviously their interest that it should be otherwise. That wide store-house of facts, experience, does not admit of our attributing to men a superfluous purity, nor would a knowledge of the world allow us to make them superior beings, when perhaps, or probably, accident alone has retrieved their inferiority.

In conformity with our feelings and thoughts, we have looked on Charles as wicked, Strafford as vile, Laud as base, though in fact they may have only been mistaken—mistaken in their own powers, though they were considerable—but what was more dangerous and eventually fatal, mistaken in the character of the British people. Still, because we have given them such felonious attributes, are we to clear their opponents from all stain, and regard these as immaculate, because they were the apostles in a great cause, but the others as apostates to the kingdom of England, and to the liberties of their country, because they defended the authority assigned by the law?

Let all have justice. The events at the latter part of the king's career shall decide whether he is to be overwhelmed with every criminal accusation; and whether a selfish ambition did not actuate some of the strong patriots; whether those who began with the worship of God did not turn to the worship of man; and whether, in the breasts of men who claimed a calm and holy sentiment as their basis of action, there did not circulate a cold current of malice and hatred; whether there did not lurk the dark aversion of envy, the fury of suppressed rage.

The energies of the Presbyterians and Independents had been concentrated on one object—the ruin of Charles. This was effected; the civil war closed in his delivering himself to the

Scotch, and he now lay at the mercy of the Parliament. Having gained this object, these two factions began to quarrel. It was a question, what should be done with him; and those who hated the person of the king were at variance with those who wished to annihilate the monarchy; the one wished to preserve the institutions of the country, the other to destroy the entire fabric. These divisions might, with a little judgment, have gained good terms and a lenient fate for the king. The Scotch and the Presbyterian party were playing into each other's hands, and the crown and life of Charles would have been saved if he had placed himself unconditionally in their power. But he was obstinate and perverse in the midst of misfortune.

"Indefinite and fallacious hopes of succour from some friendly quarter, of dissensions among his enemies, of some favourable turn of events, a confidence, in short, in Cæsar and his fortunes, co-operating with a rooted hatred of the Presbyterian discipline and every thing connected with it, as heretical and anti-monarchical, still prompted him to refuse compliance."

Guided by these feelings, Charles gave the clue for his ruin to his enemies; and in a letter quoted by Miss Aikin, written by Baillie, a Scotch covenantor, we can see how accurately the consequences of such conduct might be forecast.

"There is much talk here by all sorts of people of the king's obstinacy; that he is the longer the worse, and refuses all reason. The faction (the Independents) rejoices therein. This disposition contributes exceedingly to their wicked design. All our friends are very sorry for it. Our perplexity for him and ourselves, for the present, is very great. If he would do his duty in spite of all knaves, all would in a moment go right; but if God hath hardened him, so far as I can perceive, this people will strive to have him in their power, and make an example of him. I abhor to think of it—what they speak of execution. Every hour of his delay gives advantage to these men, who make it their business to steal votes every day, to engage the nations, and make him irreconcilable. It has been his constant unhappiness to give nothing in time. All things have been given at last; but he has ever lost the thanks, and his gifts have been counted, constrained, and extorted. A blind man sees that if he resolve to play the madman longer, he will be forced to do it within narrower bounds."

This letter tells us the views of the Independent party, and of the determination they had already taken; and easily did the victim of their game fall into the snare.

"Nor would the Independents by any means submit to take no active part in a game on which they had staked their all. Whilst the Parliamentary propositions were concocting, which the Presbyterians of both countries, and the king's friends generally, hoped to see the basis of a solid peace, Cromwell and Ireton, with the knowledge perhaps of a few of their most trusted auxiliaries, employed a clergyman to persuade him to reject these terms, and trust to the generosity of the army for conditions far more liberal. Several leading royalists were drawn into a concurrence with them, and the king himself seems to have fallen into the snare, or to have acted from other views, as if such had been the case."

The Parliament sent their delegates to the Scotch camp, with

propositions "on which ten days only of deliberation were allowed."

The Earls of Argyle and Loudon

"Besought the king on their knees to accept their terms. Loudon adding an earnest and impressive speech, in which he set before him, as the inevitable fatal consequence of his refusal, the desertion of all his English subjects, who would rise as one man to depose him, and proceed to settle religion and the state without him."

Charles was unmoved, and even returned a harsh answer, tendering proposals of his own.

"When this answer reached Westminster, it was received by the Presbyterians with consternation, by the Independents with fierce and open triumph; this party moved the House immediately that no more addresses should be made to him, and that the demand of his person from the Scotch should be enforced by Fairfax at the head of his army; and Baillie writes to his friend—'We know not at what hour they will close their doors, and declare the king fallen from his throne.'"

His dislike, or rather horror, of the Presbyterian creed, rendered him obdurate to all argument. He looked on that as totally incompatible with monarchy, and declined the most distant assent or compromise with their conditions. His friends combated this obstinacy, and tried to awaken him to the danger of his situation, and to the fact that he was no longer a free agent.

"Presbytery, or something worse, will be forced upon you, whether you will or not; the question in short is, whether you will choose to be a king of presbytery or no king—and yet presbytery or perfect independency to be," was the strong remark of one of his tried and most trusted friends. All was unavailing. Charles remained inflexible. In the mean time the two parties were struggling for their different objects; the Scotch at length agreed to give up their prisoner, and he was ordered to be removed.

"Charles was playing chess when news was brought him of the vote for his removal; with the composure which on the most trying occasions seldom deserted him, he finished his game, contenting himself with observing, that when the commissioners arrived he would let them know his pleasure. On learning, however, that the Scotch Parliament had given its formal assent to the delivery of his person, he could not forbear exclaiming, 'I am bought and sold.'"

He was thus placed at the disposal of the Presbyterian party, at that time the stronger. Parliament began, however, to dread the influence of the army, and to suspect the designs of its leaders, Cromwell and Ireton. It could not be disbanded, as they had not the means of paying the soldiers, and their fear and suspicion were daily increasing, and their weakness becoming more apparent. They proposed to send Cromwell to the Tower; but the threat only precipitated the measures which he and his friends had already planned. It was necessary to take from

their opponents the advantage they possessed in holding the king as a hostage, and the bold step was adopted of seizing and forcing from his confinement the unfortunate monarch. This was effected, and he was conducted to Hampton court. Here he received the homage, as he thought it, of the army and the Parliament, and flattered himself with the hope, that, to end all difficulties, the struggles of parties, and the wounds of civil war, the nation were once more returning to their allegiance.

“In the midst of this suspension of outward hostilities, every sect and party was working openly or secretly towards the attainment of its own peculiar ends. An agreement with the king, and his restoration on terms more or less favourable, formed, however, the basis of all the projects which were as yet avowed; and to sanguine or superficial observers it must have appeared, that the long calamities of Charles and of his people were drawing fast to a close. But it was only necessary to bring to the test of actual negotiation any one of the proposed arrangements to prove that in the relative strength or weakness, in the principles, the prejudices, the passions or the interests of the proposed contracting parties, insuperable obstacles still subsisted to any pacific arrangement. From the moment of Charles’s arrival in the quarters of the army, secret overtures had passed between him and the greater number of the military chiefs. Cromwell and Ireton, in particular, were profuse in declarations of attachment to his person and interests, which they, at the same time, affirmed to their republican friends, to have no other purpose than to divert him from closing with the propositions of their Presbyterian opponents.”

Cromwell thus continued playing the Judas with his victim. Circumstances combined to favour his purposes, as, from the hatred the king bore to the Presbyterians, it was easy to drive him to a suspicion of their designs, and to listen to the opposite party and the army. Charles appears at this time, probably from his former habits of command, to have given into a failing, unfortunate and unwise in all who have not the power to follow up an advantage, that of supposing that the interference and the exertions of friends, or professing friends, are proof of personal importance. He does not appear to have fancied for a moment that the intrigues of the various parties could have arisen from any other feeling than attachment to his person, or to monarchy, or from a fear and awe of majesty; nor does he seem to have viewed himself otherwise than a monarch, the controller of his own fate and that of England; not permitting the desolating thought to reach his bosom, that he was but a miserable captive, alone in his own dominions, and playing the puppet for the schemes of others. The intrigues going on around him served to cherish this opinion, and it is a remarkable, even an unintelligible point in this king’s character, that, to the last, pride, a violent and pertinacious tenacity of the value of self, dulled his perceptions, and utterly incapacitated him from appreciating, comprehending, or observing the motives that gov-

erned other men towards him. The fact that there were two parties in the state struggling for superiority, and that his fate depended on which was the master, interested him no farther than to attempt the deceiving both; making both his tools and his enemies. He succeeded so far as to render himself more easily worked on by the cunning and flattery of Cromwell, and hateful and contemptible by a want of faith towards those who were in reality his friends. The proposals of the army leaders, to which he had listened in private, when publicly offered were rejected with disdain; and the soldiery, from having fought against royalty, being republican, were disgusted and indignant with the king and their own officers, and even Cromwell began at length to be suspected. But he was playing his own game, and amusing the king with the idea that he could be bought at any time, and that the earldom of Essex, the insignia of the garter, and the smaller honours which smaller men covet, would seal his ends and his ambition. His influence over the king was such that he was able to induce him to decline the negotiations of the Parliament, and thus bring him more and more into his power and that of the army. It is probable that after the failure, so unexpected by the generals, of the army proposals, they saw it would be easy for Charles to involve them at any moment, when his caprice or interest might lead him to think it necessary; and they at once determined to test his disposition towards them, and their fate, in case he should be enabled to assume his throne. They effected this by intercepting a letter from Charles to the queen, "written in answer to one in which Henrietta had reproached her husband with having made" those villains, "Cromwell and Ireton too great concessions." In reference to which he told her—

"That she should leave him to manage, who was better informed of all circumstances than she could be; but that she might be entirely easy on that head, as he would know in due time how to deal with the rogues, who, instead of a silken garter, should be fitted with a hempen cord."

He likewise expressed his intention of closing with the Scotch rather than the army. From that time these associated leaders, who seem to have previously judged it the best policy of their party to make terms, temporarily at least, with the king, in order to avoid being overpowered by the Presbyterians of both countries, made up their minds to proceed in consummating his ruin. They first made him feel his captivity; and then, by secret agents, by exciting partial tumults in the army, and every other means by which the king could be alarmed and irritated, he was led to think that his situation was dangerous to his life. He fell into the trap thus laid by Cromwell, and fled from Hampton court to Carisbrook castle. Here he received com-

missioners from the Scotch and Presbyterians, and might still have preserved himself, but from his unfortunate enmity to the latter sect. His answer to their proposals—

“Was a harsh and peremptory declaration, that neither his present sufferings, nor the fear of worse, should ever prevail with him to consent to the passing of any bills before the whole terms of agreement should be settled. The commissioners, on reading it, abruptly took their departure, and hastened to inflame Parliament with their report. No one could doubt that a secret agreement with the Scotch had inspired the captive king with the boldness to reject proposals, of which the commonwealth party had dreaded his acceptance, as the likely road to his restoration. No one could doubt that a second civil war was on the point of breaking out. Cromwell and many other members now indulged in vehement invectives against Charles and against royalty, and the Independents were enabled to carry a resolution that no more addresses should be made him, nor any applications from him received.”

This was the exact condition to which Cromwell wished to bring affairs; and his only difficulty now was, to preserve the ascendancy of the army and the Independents. The royalists, in different parts, with the hope of assistance from Scotland, were raising troops, and popular feeling displayed itself in the king's favour. Cromwell and the army being called off to suppress these insurrections, the Presbyterian party seized the occasion to reverse the vote against receiving further addresses from the king. But the designs of the cavaliers and their friends were disconcerted, and the Parliament once more fell under the influence of the army. During its absence, however, new negotiations were opened with the king, the terms of which he disputed with the utmost obstinacy; and his answer was voted “with dismay and grief,” by the Parliament as unsatisfactory.

“Both houses were fully aware that nothing but a conjunction with him could enable them to resist the urgency of the army, who, elated with victory, loudly claimed what they regarded as its most precious fruits—the establishment of a government essentially, if not professedly, republican. The abolition of tithes and Episcopacy, with the recognition of entire liberty of conscience, and of the equality of all Christian sects; and lastly, the execution of ‘justice’ upon ‘the capital and grand author of all the troubles and woes which the kingdom had endured;’ as a last hope, successive resolutions were passed, by which twenty days were added to the forty, to which the treaty was originally limited.”

Notwithstanding all these exertions of those who wished the repose of the nation, the entreaties of friends, and the urgent request of Parliament, nothing could be gained from Charles but a qualified and partial concession. In mean time the army determined on having the entire disposal of his person, and, without the consent or knowledge of Parliament, he was removed from the Isle of Wight to Hurst castle. A desperate struggle now took place in the House of Commons between the parties, but the Presbyterians at length carried the vote—that there was still room for treating with Charles. The Independents, back-

ed by the army, were unwilling, or rather decided, that this constitutional mode of settling the affairs of the country should not avail. They wanted the life of the king, and while the means of intimidation were in their power, would not rest till that object was secured. The fever of patriotism had subsided to the calmer resolves of revenge; and they designed, at all hazards, to free themselves from certain danger by pursuing their defenceless victim to the death. Finding that their opponents would not yield to fear, they took the surer method of turning things in their favour, by preventing the Parliament from assembling; and armed men, stationed at the different entrances of the House of Commons, arrested the members as they appeared.

Thus finished the monarchical institutions of England, and it only remained to destroy the last fragment of royalty in the person of the king. Cromwell now held the sceptre. In the interval of suspended law he became dictator. Every movement was at his instigation, and the last hope of retrieving the misfortunes of a ruined kingdom, was transferred from the legal sway of justice to his will, from the represented opinions and feelings of a nation, to the designs of an individual. An ordinance was passed for erecting a high court of justice for the trial of the king. It was rejected by the House of Peers, now consisting of twelve members; but as it was absurd to be delayed by constitutional forms, the House of Commons, or rather the Independent party, decided as to their own power. They resolved, "that the people were the origin of all power; that therefore the Commons have supreme authority, and that whatsoever they enact hath the force of law, and that all the people of this nation are concluded thereby, although the consent and concurrence of the king and House of Peers be not had thereunto." Under the circumstances, this was a remarkably sagacious doctrine. The people of whom they spoke were represented by soldiers; the Commons by a council of generals; the House of Peers by twelve persons; the king by an imprisoned captive. The consent and concurrence of the latter was not probably to be asked, as it was hardly worth while to request a man, however legal the form, to give the sign manual to his own death warrant, which, in all likelihood, and justifiably, would have been declined if the demand had been made. But the thing proceeded without this superfluous step; and the trial opened in Westminster Hall on the 19th of January, 1648. To show with what perfect justice the affair was conducted, we extract our author's account of the structure of this court.

"In the appointment of the court by whom this unprecedented cause was to be tried, pains had been taken by the council of officers who had seized the helm of state, to render it as much as possible a representation of the different ranks and classes of society concerned in the decision. Besides

all the leading members of Parliament of the independent party, the lord general Fairfax, lieutenant general Cromwell, major general Skippon, commissary general Ireton, and all the colonels of the army; the original list comprised the two chief justices and the chief baron, six peers, several barristers, five aldermen of London, and many baronets and knights, representing the landed interest. As was to be expected, many of these persons, from various motives and considerations, public or private, prudential or conscientious, declined to take any share in the proceedings. The names of the six peers and the three judges were omitted after the rejection by the House of Peers of the ordinance. Sir Henry Vane St. John, and Algernon Sydney, who wished for the deposition of the king, and the establishment of a commonwealth, but were averse to depriving him of life, absented themselves, or refused to be nominated. The number of commissioners finally appointed was a hundred and thirty-five, but of these, less than eighty consented to take their seats. Serjeant Bradshaw, an able and accomplished lawyer, acted as president."

Thus a body of men, who represented nothing but their own interest, undertook the decision of the most important subject ever brought before any tribunal; and well might the king, when placed at the bar, arraign the authority of such a court, demanding of men whom he regarded as subjects, by what right they were constituted his judges. The right of the sword, the power of an army, which from defending the liberties of the country, turned to their subversion, and directed by the ambition of one individual, set at defiance the laws, seem to form the readiest and most obvious answer to the question. And the declaration of the king from the scaffold, that he died the martyr of the people, conveyed at that time no appearance of truth, though when usurpation had established itself in despotism, it became a fact the English nation could not deny. From the histories of the time, most of them composed by men engaged in its events, it appears that not one of those who had the interest of their cause most at heart, ever wished or conceived the death of the king. They designed that the laws should draw the bounds to the encroachments of the prerogative, and if under the reigning monarch this were impossible, they were willing to appeal to the sword, and, if victorious, utterly destroy the prevailing form of government, and substitute a republic. But such was their purity of motive, their love of justice, and absence of all selfish sources of action, they wished no persecution nor straining of law, till it admitted the shedding of blood; and it is a triumphant gratification to the republicans of after ages, that the men whose spirit they inherit were the defenders, not destroyers, of social order—patriots and reformers, but not anarchists. Charles the First was undoubtedly the cause of his own misfortunes, and his ruin was the triumph of liberty, but his death was the tyranny of faction, and its mode a judicial assassination. One moral may be gathered from this revolution—that no old country can new

model itself by the adoption of a new government or the effect of new principles. It is forbidden by the influence of time; by the antiquity of laws, habits and manners; by the fixed veneration men bear to institutions whose character is associated with historic recollection, with the pride and power gathered by the virtue and the energies of genius; and, in this instance, it is proved by England's easy submission to the iron rule of Cromwell; by the insidious despotism of Charles the Second; by the second revolution of 1688, and by the wounds she still feels, and from which she yet bleeds.

ART. II.—*Bibliotheca Classica, or a Classical Dictionary; containing a copious account of the principal proper names mentioned in ancient authors; with the value of the coins, weights and measures used among the Greeks and Romans; and a chronological table.* By J. LEMPRIERE, D.D. *A new edition, enlarged, remodelled and extensively improved.* By CHARLES ANTHON, L.L.D. Jay Professor of the Greek and Latin languages, and of Archæology and Ancient Geography, and Rector of the Grammar School in Columbia College, New York. New York, G. & C. & H. Carvill; H. C. Sleight, 1833. Two vols. 8vo. pp. 1636.

UNDER our wise law of copyright, so well adapted to the encouragement of native literature, the following seems to be the approved receipt for book-making. Take an English book of tolerable reputation, and employ an American editor; let the latter just add so much as will make it a shade better than the English publication, and then take out a copyright for his additions. The original English work will be excluded from the market by its high price, and any mere reprint of it can be cried down as less valuable than that which has the additions and corrections. It thus happens that it is hardly possible for an original American work, upon a subject which an English author has already treated, to find a publisher, when the other is to be had for little, and benefits tantamount to a copyright of the whole can be secured at a comparatively small cost of labour in an editor, and money to the bookseller.

Were we to reciprocate to English authors the privileges our own possess in Great Britain, the case would be reversed, and an original American work, upon any subject, would come fairly into competition even with the best of Europe; but in the

present system, not only new books of our own, upon any didactic subject already handled by an English author, but even translations from the best authorities of the continent of Europe, are almost excluded from our press.

Dr. Anthon made his appearance in the literary world as editor of the works of another, and in his first edition seems to have aimed at little more than quieting the fears of his publishers in respect to competition. His publication was somewhat better than the original of Lempriere, and his task appeared fulfilled. It has happened fortunately for the literary public, that he has not been contented to stop there.

Lempriere's Classical Dictionary was the work of the author's youth, and in his after life he gave himself up to other pursuits. It appeared at a time when the Delphin editions of the classics were about to give place to tests more critically correct, and when it began to be doubted whether notes in the same language with the works to be studied were the most efficient helps to the youthful student. Lempriere, to meet this double want, seems to have translated the notes explanatory of the proper names which are to be found in the Latin authors from the Delphin editions, and to have arranged them in alphabetic order. Some few in relation to Grecian subjects were added, and thus a book was manufactured of convenient form, and ready reference, which was unquestionably no bad aid to those who had neither the time nor inclination to consult higher and less exceptionable authorities.

The articles copied or translated by Lempriere, were drawn from sources by no means the highest or most correct. Of this his editor early became aware, and even his first edition marks the attention he had paid to the correction of those articles which had necessarily become the objects of his attention, in the authors he was in the habit of reading with his classes. Errors and inaccuracies of no small amount however remained, and much trivial and useless matter served to swell the book, although it still attained no very formidable size.

Defective as the work still continued, it was notwithstanding too useful to the student of the Greek and Latin languages to be dispensed with; the first edition was speedily exhausted, and another called for. The publishers seem now to have become aware that the American editor was really capable of making a better book than his English author, and Dr. Anthon appears to have been encouraged to extend his researches, to correct all he found faulty, and to add whatever he might conceive useful. The same policy has been pursued to the third edition, and the third octavo of Lempriere has grown into a ponderous tome of sixteen hundred pages. Many of the trivial articles of the original have been omitted, and a great part of the remainder

wholly written over, while new subjects of no small importance have been introduced and treated in a full, sometimes we must say in a diffuse manner.

The work has in fact become Dr. Anthon's, and the name of Lempriere rather remains to exhibit the manner in which his editor was led to undertake the labour, than as an evidence of his having contributed in any important degree to its value.

Still, the *Classical Dictionary* has not yet assumed a perfect and consistent form. We can yet discern the coarse fabric of Lempriere making the basis of its texture; and upon it we see sewed, like purple patches, articles prepared by the editor in the most scholar-like manner. But we are also compelled to note, in other places, crude and contradictory opinions, the vague and inaccurate opinions of others, adopted without mature reflection, and pressed with equal pertinacity with those that are the laborious product of the editor's own judgment.

He indeed shows throughout the most extensive reading and industrious research; but we must say he has not always evinced discrimination in the choice of his authorities, and has in some places adopted and urged with equal earnestness, opinions utterly irreconcilable.

Still, the character of editor, which he yet preserves, shields him from any severity of criticism; we are bound to be thankful to him for what he has effected, and have no right to complain that he has done no more. Lempriere's original work would be of no small value had our editor never commenced his labours, and each of the latter's successive editions has become a more useful auxiliary to the mere learner, while the one before us has unquestionably attained a character which will make it a material aid even to the most profound scholar.

We are at least certain that if the adept should in more than one instance be startled by what he may conceive obvious paradoxes, he must bring into play all his erudition to gainsay or refute them.

Dr. Anthon's reputation now stands so well established, that he need no longer fight in borrowed armour, or protect himself from criticism under the shield of Lempriere's name. We therefore hope that the next form in which the *Classical Dictionary* shall make its appearance, will bear his own name upon the title page as author, and that he will make himself directly responsible for all it contains. Then, if we may judge from two or three of the articles which have evidently received the care and attention an author will bestow upon his own effusions, we shall have a work as far exceeding that before us, as it does its meagre original.

If we might advise him as to his course, when he shall assume an author's responsibility, we should recommend much pruning

in some of his articles, and a more frequent reference to original authorities, in preference to commentators. Still more would we urge upon him a greater degree of caution in receiving the dictation of the modern German critics, who, coming into a field almost exhausted by the labours of their predecessors, have sought the reputation of originality by scepticism in respect to established opinions, and bold utterance of extravagant hypotheses.

With such general views of the character of the work, and giving to the editor the high praise of having accomplished what no other American scholar has ventured to undertake, and what the learned of the mother country have feared to venture upon, we will now enter into some disquisitions for which his articles, or those of his author, shall furnish our text. We shall rarely stop to point out where our inferences differ from theirs. We could indeed wish to avoid even the appearance of disputing the authority of a work that must hold the rank of a standard, and may be content if our investigations furnish the editor with hints by which he may add to the value of his subsequent editions, and excite the attention of those who feel inclined to study the articles of the work before us, not in their isolated form, but in their connexion with each other.

No subject in a work of this character, intended as it is to throw light upon the authors of antiquity, can be considered more important than that of chronology. Without a just and accurate view of the dates at which important events have happened, history is often involved in inextricable confusion; and yet it often happens that so vague is the record which ancient authorities have left us, or so contradictory their statements, that we are compelled to have recourse to the re-calculation of astro-nomic phenomena, or the discussion of probabilities, to supply their defects, or to reconcile their discrepancies. The reformation of the Roman calendar by Julius Cæsar, furnishes a fixed point, whence we may calculate in antecedent and successive directions, the time at which events have taken place. This occurred forty-six years before the vulgar era of the birth of our Saviour. From that reformation to the present day, uninterrupted calendars have been preserved by civilized nations; and if in some countries the irruption of barbarians may have rendered historic evidences scanty or uncertain, no doubt remains as to the whole lapse of time. This reformation, however, does not furnish the zero of the scale of years. All Christian, and therefore all civilized nations, count from the birth of Christ. This method of computation was not, however, introduced in the time of those who had witnessed the life of our Saviour, and could have fixed the date of his nativity without mistake. On counting back to it, an error was made of four years, as has now

been long known, from reference to the eclipse that occurred near the time of the death of Herod. The vulgar era is therefore that number of years in defect. This is, however, unimportant in its bearing upon civil history, as the reformation of the calendar by Julius Cæsar is in fact the starting point.

The exodus of the Israelites is another epoch of the greatest importance in chronology. It was attended with and followed by convulsions and contests in Egypt, that made many of its inhabitants seek for foreign settlements, to which they carried the arts and the religion of that country. Averse as that people have always been to foreign enterprise, it required some most important change of circumstances to compel them to emigration, or to enter into the career of foreign conquest. Profane history still informs us, when collated with the sacred volume, that upon the destruction of the forces of Egypt in their pursuit of the Israelites, the shepherd race resumed their conquests in lower Egypt, and even made incursions to the cataracts; that when they were driven out by a succeeding monarch, Sesostris, he paused not after driving them to the borders, but pursued his victorious career into other countries. It also informs us that on his return he found his power usurped by a brother, whom he subdued and drove into exile.

The conquest of Canaan by the Israelites forced a number of fugitives from the arms of Joshua to trust their fortunes to the sea, and thus the civilization of Palestine was carried along the southern shores of the Mediterranean, and a foundation laid for the power of Carthage. Other emigrants must have taken other directions, and borne the religion and customs of Canaan to mingle with those of Italy and Greece.

We conceive that the era of the exodus is well fixed at 1491 before Christ. Almost contemporary with this we find Cadmus proceeding from Phenicia to lay the foundations of Thebes, and Danaus carrying the arts of Egypt to Argos. Other methods of computation carry the date of the exodus farther back, but we think there is strong reason for admitting the date we have stated as settled, upon the authority of Usher, and the reading of the Hebrew text of the Scriptures. Indeed, from this time downwards, the different texts agree, but the chronology of the Book of Judges is susceptible of extension, if all the events it records be considered as successive, and hence the difference in the estimate of different authors.

It is otherwise with the period that elapsed from the deluge to the calling of Abraham. Many good reasons might be assigned for receiving a chronology for this period different from that of Usher. At any rate, we conceive that table of chronology to be defective which does not give both modes of computation, particularly as all writers, except those of England, who blindly

follow Usher, incline to prefer the dates of the Samaritan to those of the Hebrew text. Even the double computation ought perhaps to be extended to the erection of the temple of Solomon, at which period the genealogy of the descendants of David affords almost certain dates. If this be not done, uncertainty will exist whenever authors who do not receive Usher's chronology are consulted, and it may often appear that profane history, and still more the conclusions of geology, are at variance with the sacred volume. These doubts cannot exist when the dates of the Samaritan pentateuch are admitted; and we can find room both for the formation of mighty empires, at a date that would have been impossible under the hypothesis of Usher, and for alluvial formations and changes on the surface of the globe, that we see have occurred, and which have sometimes been the cause of scepticism. In the tables of Dufresnoy, the computations of Usher from the Hebrew text, and those from the Samaritan, run parallel to each other until the time when their discrepancy ceases.

The dawn of certain chronology among the Greeks does not commence before the first Olympiad. But although these quadriennial celebrations are recorded from the first, in 776 B. C., they are not referred to as dates by any writer before the age of Alexander, more than four hundred years later. All intermediate dates, if fixed in terms of the Olympiads, are calculated backwards, and thus partake in some degree of the previous uncertainty; thus, even in these comparatively recent periods, errors of no small moment may exist, and they have not been remedied by the labours of those chronologers whose works are in most repute. A most marked instance of this kind is to be found in the history of the Lydian kings, terminating with the capture of Sardes by Cyrus. The record of Herodotus is most precise on this subject, making Cræsus contemporary with Solon and the usurpation of Pisistratus at Athens. The chronology of Usher separates the promulgation of Solon's laws from the passage of the Halys by Cræsus, by an interval of forty-eight years, and thus throws the beginning of the reign of that monarch so far from the time in which the lawgiver flourished, as to render it impossible that they could have seen and conversed as the historian testifies they did. Yet on the date of the passage of the Halys, the whole connexion between sacred and profane, between Grecian and Asiatic history depends; if we reject the evidence of Herodotus on this point, we can put no faith in his other assertions, and all previous history becomes a mass of ill-digested fable. This interview between the king and the lawgiver did take place notwithstanding, and we can by means of it reconcile a number of facts that now appear contradictory. Solon died in the year 558; the chronology received by our

author places the coming of Cræsus to the throne in 560, and his downfall in 546. Now as the interview between them did not precede the fall of Cræsus by more than six years, the dates are utterly irreconcilable. The ancient historian, however, tells us, that two years after the death of his son Atys, which appears to have happened immediately after the departure of Solon, Cræsus was alarmed by the destruction of the empire of Astyages by Cyrus. Now this happened in 560, and at the end of three years the Lydian kingdom was overthrown; the latter event therefore occurred in 557 instead of 546. We thus find that the history of Herodotus is consistent with itself, and that Cræsus was in fact contemporary not only with Solon, but with Pittacus, who died in 570, with the usurpation of Pisistratus, and even with the last years of the life of Thales. The errors into which the chronologists have fallen, seem to have arisen from a miscalculation of the date of the eclipse predicted by Thales, and which, it is related, separated the armies of the Medes and Lydians when engaged in combat. This cessation of arms, under superstitious terrors, caused the mediation of a peace between the hostile nations, brought about a series of events that changed the whole face of Asia, and led an army of Scythians over its territories to the very confines of Egypt. This eclipse is placed by some authors as late as 584, when the principal actors were, as is admitted on all hands, long dead; by none is it made earlier than 607, while in the chronology of Usher it is placed in 597. We concur with Volney in placing this eclipse in 625, when one far more consistent in its phenomena than any other did actually occur. From this date to the time we have assumed for the taking of Sardes by Cyrus, there is room for the events recorded by the historian, and all is clear and consistent. As the editor has in his text recorded the interviews of Cræsus and Solon, it might have fairly been expected that he would not permit his chronological table to contradict his history. Nor is this the only instance in which dates ascertained from more accurate investigations are exhibited in the text itself, while the table has been permitted to remain without amendment. Indeed, we should suspect from the transfer of this table from the beginning to the end of the work, that the editor intended to make corrections, which his leisure has not permitted him to complete.

It has been a favourite theory with many writers, to seek for the origin of arts and sciences, and of much of the religion and mythology of the ancients, in Judea, or in some country to the north of it, whence that country itself derived them. No doubt can indeed exist that, upon the fertile borders of the Ganges and the Indus, communities must have been formed at an early date, in which the arts of social life were cultivated. But

we apprehend that it has been a gross mistake to conceive that they ever attained any very high degree of perfection, or had any influence upon the civilization of other parts of the globe.

The hypothesis which makes the arts and gods of India proceed from that country to Meroe, thence descend the Nile to Egypt, and thus make their way to Greece, is, in our opinion, particularly ill-founded. At the early date at which such communication must, if ever, have taken place, we see no possibility of its occurrence. Navigation of the open ocean was not practised, and migration by land must have been slow, and have affected all the intervening regions, in which no trace has ever been discovered of such a transit.

German writers, dazzled by the assumptions of the Hindoos themselves, and deceived by the frauds now acknowledged and detected, that were practised upon some of the writers in the Asiatic researches, have persevered in their belief of this seducing theory. But strict investigations have stripped the literature and science of Hindostan of their boasted antiquity. The astronomy of the Hindoos is now well known to be derived directly and without alteration from that of Ptolemy; their arithmetic is the same as that of Archimedes; and now that we know that almost every province of the peninsula has its own sacred language, we can almost subscribe to the bold opinion of Stewart, that the Sanscrit is not an original whence the vulgar tongue is derived, but a factitious language prepared for the use of the priesthood, in which the ordinary terms of the spoken language are subjected to the inflexions and modifications of a foreign dialect. For the formation of its grammar upon the model of the Greek, we might find a reason in the brilliant reign of a Greek dynasty, not only upon its borders, but over much of its surface, long after all direct communication with the parent country was cut off by the Parthians; and for its analogy in roots with the Gothic tongues, in the vicinity of Persia, in the actual dominion of a cognate race to the Germans, on the banks of the Indus. These are truths not only to be inferred from slight notices in classic writers, but now well established by translations from Chinese authorities of cotemporaneous dates.

These facts we shall endeavour to illustrate. We have express testimony that at the date at which profane history takes its rise, India was yet in the hands of a race who, except in one instance, (and we shall have reason to doubt even that,) never made any progress in the arts and sciences, and who, down to the present day, have no title to be styled civilized, except in the countries where they are constrained to order and industrious habits under the severe pressure of bondage.

The name of Ethiopian, in the Greek writers, is unquestionably descriptive of the peculiar features and characters which we

still see in the negro race. Mere difference of colour did not in the absence of the other distinctions authorize the employment of this name. The same is the case with the epithet of Cushite, employed in the Scriptures. Now Homer makes a broad distinction between the Ethiopians of the east and of the west. The latter were certainly the negroes of Africa; the former are not so readily located.

The eastern Ethiopians make their appearance in Herodotus as forming a part of the army of Xerxes, and as drawn from provinces lying in the vicinity of the Indian satrapy of that monarch, which included no more than the valley of the river, whence the name is derived.

We here see the separation of the race which, confident in its physical powers, first aspired to empire under Nimrod, into two distinct parts, one of which had been forced towards the sources of the Nile, the other driven beyond the Indus. Nor can we believe that the civilization of the empire of Meroe was due to this race, but to one more nearly cognate to the Egyptians, who in their features and form differ widely from the true Ethiopian.

Did we want any farther evidence that the original population of India was Ethiopian, we still find the race existing in that country, to attest its ancient prevalence. These in scanty numbers, and savage in their habits, occupy fastnesses in the nearer peninsula, under the name of Jains.

A similar nation occupies the Andaman Islands, is not entirely extinct in Sumatra and Java, but constitutes the whole population of the remote Papua, whence, in all probability, the jet black natives of New Holland, the most degraded of the human race, have derived their origin. So late as the age of Xerxes we may therefore consider the whole of modern Hindostan, with the exception of the valley of the Indus itself, and the extreme north, as occupied by an Ethiopic race.

This had been first divided on the banks of the Euphrates into two parts, by a Semitic tribe; the eastern portion had been compelled to quit Persia by a people having a common origin with the Goths and Germans; had retreated across the valley of the Indus, and now yielded a partial submission to the Gorat king.

From this date the eastern Ethiopians disappear, at least in name, from history. It seems probable, that new emigrations from the north separated them from the inhabitants of the banks of the Indus, and that successive swarms of conquering nations finally reduced them to the scattered remnant that now exists. Still, as late as when Strabo wrote, the whole of the southern part of Hindostan was occupied by a negro race, if colour, crisped hair, and form of countenance, be sufficient to entitle it to that epithet.

The pretensions of the Hindoos to any very remote antiquity, at least in their occupation of their present seats, are then wholly unfounded. Their own pretended histories are indeed readily resolvable into astronomic cycles, and the rule of fancied dynasties to the course and revolutions of the planets.

Herodotus gives us but little information as to any part of India, except that subjected to the Persians. He regards the country as almost wholly sandy, and therefore his knowledge of its mere surface did not extend beyond the desert that forms the western boundary of Rajahstan, now so well known in the description of Todd. He represents India as inhabited by various nations, speaking each a different language; some of these possessed herds of cattle and fed on their flesh; others had no such means of support; while many resided in marshes and supported themselves upon raw fish: the dress of the natives was made of rushes and the bark of trees. Still farther to the east a nation was known to him, by report, who slew their parents and friends when they became old or sickly, and eat them. As every investigation which has been made in modern times has tended to confirm the good faith of Herodotus, and to show that he was not only solicitous of accuracy, but had at his disposal the best means of intelligence that the age could afford, we may ask whether in these savages we are to look for that enlightened race, who, according to the fanciful theories now so sagely quoted, carried the sciences to Meroe, whence they descended the Nile to Egypt, and thus became through Greece the origin of all that the world possesses of taste, of literature and of science.

One only point in the narration of Herodotus has the slightest bearing upon the Hindoos of the present day. Among the tribes we have spoken of was one that slew no animal, and lived wholly on a vegetable diet; but so far from being a polished or even an agricultural nation, their food was the spontaneous product of the earth.

The conquests of Alexander extended but little beyond the possessions or tributaries of the Persian monarchs; but he carried with his army persons well qualified to describe what they saw, and to collect the traditions of the country. Still, imbued with the prevailing vanity of their countrymen, they were ready to transpose all they heard into such form as to suit their own mythology, or redound to their national glory. What they collected is recorded by Arrian, and had reference to the inhabitants only of the north of the peninsula. There can be no doubt that by this time the worship of Sivah had become prevalent in these regions. The Greeks, however, chose to see in him their own Bacchus, and the representation of this deity,

bearded and of mature age, became thenceforward a favourite subject of the Grecian chisel. The identity even in name of other legendary personages with those specified in the sacred books of the Hindoos, has been fully illustrated by De Guignes.* Among the objects of the Indian fables, the Greeks also imagined they had discovered their Hercules. This personage was no other than Vishnou, between whom and the Hercules of fable, not the real hero of Tiryns, there exists a certain degree of resemblance in their extensive journies and in the destruction of fabled monsters.

An unexpected light is thrown upon the portions of the history of India that intervenes between the times in which Herodotus wrote, and those in which Alexander conquered. Masoudi,† an Arab writer, informs us that the Hindoos first established themselves in a country called the great Houza, and that Brahman was their first king. In his reign the Indians discovered mines of iron and other metals, learned to manufacture arms, and to build temples. The descendants of this prince are called Brahmins, and are held in great veneration among the Indians. In his days seven sages flourished, and the nation was divided into seventy sects.

Brahman was succeeded by his son Baboudh (Buddha), and the latter by Zaman, who was engaged in wars against both the Persians and the Chinese. After Zaman followed the reign of Phour (Porus), who was defeated by Alexander.

Thus Porus was only in the third generation from the first of his race who had penetrated into India, and although the authority we quote is not such as would be received of itself, yet as it is strictly conformable to what we can gather from the writings of Herodotus, and the recitals of those who accompanied Alexander, it may be received as a strong corroboration of the inferences we derive from their accounts.

The Seleucidæ extended their conquests farther into India than Alexander had done, and penetrated even to the Ganges. Hence, however, they were soon driven by a native prince. The Greeks soon after founded a kingdom in Bactria, which, although separated from their countrymen of the west by the Parthian empire, attained no small degree of power, and lasted for more than a century. This kingdom extended its arms beyond the Indus, and probably had an influence upon the civilization not only of India, but even of regions more remote, far more powerful than is usually admitted.

Menander, the third Greek monarch, carried his arms far to

* See Mem. de l'Academie des Inscript. vol. 45.

† See De Guignes in Mem. de l'Academie des Inscriptions.

the east, and according to one reading of Strabo, even came in contact with the Seres or Chinese. Eueratides, the son and successor of Menander, also exercised great influence in India, until he was despoiled of his provinces there by Mithridates, king of Parthia.

The Greek kingdom of Bactria was destroyed in 126 B. C. by a Nomadic horde, whom the Chinese knew under the name of Su. At the same moment another Scythian race ravaged the kingdom of the Parthians. This last nation established itself in Khorasan, and after a lapse of one hundred years entered into Bactria and destroyed the kingdom of Su. Thence they penetrated into India, and founded an empire known to Ptolemy and Arrian by the name of Indo-Scythia. This endured in a high state of power in India for upwards of six hundred years, and although the subjects of the Roman empire know them only in the vicinity of the Indus, the Chinese inform us that in the interior of the peninsula they extended their dominion far to the south and south-east. Extensive as was this Indo-Scythian empire, and long as was its duration, it seems to have made little change in the religion of India or in the habits of its people. Like the Manchau conquerors of China, they seem to have adopted the tenets and customs of their subjects. One singular practice only was derived from them, which still marks the prevalence of their power, and shows that their influence, if not their actual empire, had extended further than we would infer from either Roman or Chinese authority. They were in the habit of having a single wife in common to several husbands. Some of their women had no less than ten; usually the husbands of each wife were brothers or near relations; but when there were no brothers, a person wishing to take a wife was compelled to associate several of his friends with him. This custom is one not yet extinct in India, but it was found prevailing in its full extent by De Gama, in the first expedition of the Portuguese, and this at the most remote part of the Deccan. Yet of this empire, of long duration and extended sway, the books of the Hindoos themselves give us no history.

The physiologist looks with wonder upon the conformation of the higher castes of India. He sees in them unquestionable specimens of the Caucasian race, and thus ascribes to them an affiliation and origin in common with the nations of western Europe. When he learns, however, that for six centuries a race who called themselves Getæ held undisputed sway on the banks of the Indus, extended their empire to the sacred waters of the Ganges itself, and had power to introduce the most revolting of their national customs, and cause it to prevail as far as Cape Cormorin, his astonishment must cease, and he will see the family

resemblance sufficiently accounted for in the identity of the common Gothic stock.

India therefore, at a time when Egypt had forever lost its independent existence, when its arts and learning had passed their zenith and begun to decline, was still barbarous in the extreme, with the single exception of the valley of the Indus, which had become a province of the Persian empire. By the time of Alexander, a power had made its appearance in the northern part that was of sufficient importance to resist his arms. This was no doubt a race of some degree of civilization, who had in the interval passed into India from the north. This power was weakened by the conquests of the Seleucidæ, and overthrown by the Greek dynasty of Bactria. The latter, in addition to their own empire, gave birth to a kingdom held by Grecian rulers, that included parts of central India and the whole of the Malabar coast. The Bactrian kingdom was destroyed by Nomadic tribes, who, after occupying it for a century, gave way to another race of Scythian origin, which extended its conquests into India, in which it ruled for more than six centuries. The Greeks, as we have seen, admitted the deities of the first of these nations as identical with their Bacchus and Hercules; no reason therefore existed why they should not bow at the same altars with their Indian subjects.

The Scythian race also adopted, without hesitation, the dogmas of Brahminical faith. Thus no difficulty existed in the union of the whole into one common people. But this must have been effected in a most peculiar manner, peculiar at least to European views, but to which something analogous may be seen on our own continent. The original settlers of India were, as we have seen, negroes in colour and physiological characters. The invaders, as was certainly the case with the Greeks, and as the inverted custom of polygamy proves in respect to the Scythians, were armed bands accompanied by but few females. Analogy will allow us to assert the same of the previous race that founded the kingdom of Porus. Their very position as conquerors, and the paucity of their own females, must have caused the procreation of races possessing every shade of colour and complexion that the mixture of white with Ethiopic blood can produce. These races, issues in various proportions of conquering nations, superior in arts, in wars and in intellect, and of people of rude, savage and stolid character, must have mutually regarded each other, and been regarded by the unmixed descendants of the conquerors, as varying in character and importance according to the proportion of the blood of the superior race which they possessed. The higher races would of course seek to throw upon the lower all duties and occupations that were either in fact or from custom of a degrading charac-

ter, and each of these would in its turn throw upon those beneath them, the labours they were too proud to undertake. Did not slavery level all such distinctions in our southern states, a similar state of things would already have made its appearance there; and even as it is, the shades of distinction are nicely drawn among the slaves themselves; the females pride themselves on bearing children of lighter colour than their own, and those most near to the European race, prefer a state of concubinage with the whites to a lawful union with those of their own caste.

In India the higher castes called in the aid of religious feeling to prevent the farther corruption of their own blood, and the invasion of the occupations they had reserved to themselves by those beneath them; and in this so many of the castes must have had an interest, that it could not be resisted by those who had reason to be aggrieved. Egypt was also continually subject to invasions from Phenicia and Arabia, until its various states became consolidated into one kingdom, of power sufficient not only to resist foreign inroads, but to command the obedience of its neighbours; and we cannot hesitate in believing that this state of things gave rise to the distinction of castes which existed there also, as it must infallibly do whenever two races exist contemporaneously in a country so widely diversified in physical characters, that every shade and variation in their mixture can be detected by external signs.

In India, indeed, a fervid sun has confounded one of these distinctions, namely, that of colour. Even in the pure and unmingled blood of the children of the sun—an epithet which we cannot help believing must have arisen from the golden hair and fair complexions of their Scythian ancestors—the colour has become swarthy, and in some cases almost black, although the females are at least as fair as those of the south of Europe. So the Israelites who have existed in Hindostan from the time of the dispersion of the ten tribes, are as black as negroes, while those of more modern introduction have not yet exhibited the effects of climate in so marked a degree; but the Portuguese of India are instances of a still more rapid change, having in less than three centuries lost every trace of European complexion.

To the Greeks the inhabitants of India owe the introduction of astronomy and of the decimal system of arithmetic. The former still remains exactly as it was transmitted by Heppanhus; but in the latter the Indians made a most manifest improvement by the introduction of the character 0, and the consequent reduction of the characters used by Archimedes, which numbered ten for each successive rise in the decimal scale, to a single series, deriving values from their relative position.

A just appreciation of the value of what the classic authors

have left us in respect to India ought to prevent our being the willing dupes of the detected frauds practised upon the English writers in the Asiatic researches; while a careful study of astronomy and arithmetic, as cultivated in India and Greece, should save us from being misled by the eloquence of those writers who have substituted ingenious declamation for solid argument.

The cradle of the human race has been placed upon some fertile table-land in central Asia, which travellers have been unable to detect or geographers to exhibit upon their maps. Here the sciences are supposed to have been cultivated, the arts to have flourished, and literature to have prevailed. Hence they are imagined to have been conveyed to the nations that are known to us by tradition or by history, impaired, however, and diminished in their importance, as they receded from the common centre. In contradistinction to this vain theory we see a clear and authentic history of the origin and progress of the human race in the sacred volume.

Before its records cease we find the historians of Greece imparting to us the traditions of the Gentile nations, and the series continues unbroken through the Roman authors and their Grecian cotemporaries, until it reaches our own days. So far then as the western nations of the old continent are concerned, we believe that little has been lost that is of any essential value. Each country and nation takes its place in authentic history so soon as its importance or state of civilization entitles it to notice.

Another source of history has been brought to light in modern times. This consists in the official annals of the Chinese empire. China, a nation long almost unknown to the western parts of the old continent, had, like Egypt and Assyria, its own focus of civilization on the fertile banks of a mighty stream. Hence it spread its power and influence throughout the surrounding regions, until it reckons among its subjects a very large proportion of the whole number of the inhabitants of the earth. Long possessed of letters, peculiar indeed in form and application, it has had a regular series of chronicles from remote times. If the earlier part of these perished by the brutal orders of a tyrant, the remainder are still in perfect preservation. We have seen an instance in the discussion with respect to India, how they and the historians of the West confirm each other. The truth even of their minutest details being thus established in one case, we have a right to infer that the whole is true also. We have already seen how these annals supply the deficiencies of western historians in relation to the Greek kingdom of Bactria, and have applied them to illustrate the history of Hindostan at a time when we have no other authorities.

Human society was, beyond all question, first formed in the plains of Mesopotamia. Thence a large portion of mankind was speedily dispersed in various directions, in families and tribes, to assume in their new abodes the occupations of hunters, shepherds, or husbandmen, according to the character of the region to which their steps were directed. The remnant left upon the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, speedily formed two kingdoms, whose royal seats were Babylon and Nineveh. The former seat was founded by Nimrod, a son of Cush, and consequently a progenitor of the race afterwards called Ethiopic; the latter by Assur, a descendant of Shem, who imprinted his name upon the empire of Assyria. If the former was, as we are expressly informed, the earliest in date, it yielded at last to the superior force of the latter; for the earliest profane historian shows us Babylon as a mere satrapy of the monarchs of Nineveh, and we find Arabia first designated as the land of Cush in sacred writ; it was therefore an early possession of his descendants. Hence too they were finally driven by the descendants of Joctan and Ishmael, and the last named race has not ceased to pursue them, either as conquerors or religious missionaries, until the faith of Mecca is received, and the supremacy of Arab arms is felt on the remote banks of the Gambia and the Senegal.

But the Cushites of Arabia were not the only portion of the race that escaped from the rule of the Assyrian kings. We have seen another division, retiring westward through Persia, finally yielding to the superior energy of the descendants of Japhet and Shem, broken into petty clans in Hindostan, and only retaining existence as a nation in the most remote islands of the Indian Archipelago. In this direction too they have been followed by the military apostles of Mahometanism, who seem as if fated to be the principal instruments to effect the ancient malediction that still presses on that unfortunate race. It is not for us to scrutinize the unerring decrees of Providence, but we may venture to express a hope that the divine denunciation is on the point of being appeased; and that a portion of the race of Cush, trained among ourselves, although in servitude, to the arts of the European family, is about to carry back to the banks of the Niger, the germs of a civilization which shall be the means of elevating the country of their origin to a just level in the scale of nations.

The earliest history of the Assyrian kingdom has reference to an epoch of activity, in which many of the nations of Asia were subjected to its sway. With this epoch are connected the almost fabulous names of Nineveh and Semiramis.

Even Nineveh, however, did not assume the rank of the seat of a great empire at so early a period as is usually stated. The

epoch of the power of the Assyrian empire is usually carried back to the date fixed by Diodorus, upon the authority of Ctesias, and we have lists of kings preserved that are considered as tallying with this boasted antiquity. Our own opinion is most decided, that no very powerful empire could have existed upon the Euphrates or Tigris in the time of Solomon. Had one been so placed, it is morally impossible but it must have come in contact with his extensive dominions, and we should have possessed the record either of their hostility or their friendship. A king of Shinar, too, figures in the time of Abraham, and one of Mesopotamia, in the Book of Judges; both of whom are inconsistent with the supremacy Assyria is supposed to have assumed even at the former date. Here again we have recourse to the father of history as our surest guide. He makes the duration of the Assyrian empire over the higher Asia no more than five hundred and forty years, instead of thirteen hundred and fifty, as is usually stated on the authority of Ctesias. If we count back from the date assigned for the death of Sardanapalus in the text of our editor, the first extension of the power of Nineveh, beyond its own immediate vicinity, took place in 1287 B. C.; while, if we reckon from the final destruction of the kingdom of Assyria, the origin of that power is no earlier than 1152 B. C.

The earliest date given for the death of Sardanapalus, in the chronological table, is 900 B. C., which would carry back the epoch of the Assyrian empire to 1440 B. C. We must say that the second of these computations appears to us far the most reasonable and probable; but in adopting it we should be compelled to abandon the almost universal belief that Nineveh was twice taken by the united arms of Media and Babylon.

From the bustling period when the sway of Nineveh was first extended over the higher Asia, her successive monarchs are said to have slumbered in luxurious ease for thirty generations, to the time of Sardanapalus, in whom their dynasty closed. This quiet and probably wholesome exercise of their power, under which their subjects must have enjoyed tranquillity, if not happiness, is confirmed by the entire silence the scriptures maintain in relation to this country, so contiguous to Judea, until a comparatively late period in the history of the kings of Israel, when under a new dynasty the Assyrians had resumed their pristine vigour. Whatever of improvement this people possessed, must have descended with little diminution to their Persian conquerors.

An early settlement was formed also on the banks of the Nile, and here civilization appears to have made even more rapid progress than on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris. The first

seat of regal power in Egypt is stated, by Manetho, to have been at Zhis, a city that does not make its appearance in the Classical Dictionary.

It appears probable that the successive swarms from this original hive formed separate communities at different points upon the stream, penetrating on the one hand into Nubia, as far as Meroe, and, on the other, occupying the Delta, as it was slowly formed by the deposit of the river. These separate states fell an easy prey to a horde of savage conquerors, known by the name of the Shepherds. These invaders penetrated as far as the cataracts, but held no long rule in Upper Egypt, where Thebes, although occupied for a moment, speedily recovered its independence, and became the seat of a sovereignty that finally united the whole of Egypt under its sway. The power of the Theban monarchs was occasionally prevalent in Nubia, where they disputed with the kings of Meroe for its possession, which seems to have been alternately held by either. These rulers of Ethiopia, on more than one occasion, subdued Egypt itself, and even led their armies beyond the desert into Palestine.

That the country below the cataracts of Nile was settled first, and became the source of the population which occupied the higher valley, is, we think, proved by a single fact. The whole of the Thebaid is naturally suited to produce the food of mankind, being annually covered by an inundation that leaves on its retreat the ground prepared for the reception of seed, almost without tillage; while in Nubia, the valley, lying upon a high bank, is never inundated, and must be prepared for the production of grain by the laborious process of artificial irrigation. To undertake and accomplish this would require a skill and intelligence beyond the search of the early settlers, who, had they penetrated from Arabia to the upper valley of the Nile, must have starved before it could have been brought into cultivation. Nor would it have been sought as an eligible habitation until the spontaneously productive Thebaid had become crowded with inhabitants or desolated by wars.

If Meroe, as many authorities concur in stating, did actually precede the Thebaid in civilization, and communicated its religion and sacerdotal caste, this may be well explained, not by conceiving that Meroe derived them from some foreign source, but from the consideration that, secluded by remoteness of position from the conflicts and devastations to which Egypt was so frequently subjected, its inhabitants had the leisure to cultivate the arts of peace. Allied in blood and habits of life, the people of Egypt would naturally have recourse to that of Meroe for the civilization that their own convulsions had prevented them from attaining. A colony of priests may have been im-

ported by some Egyptian monarch, to add to his own legitimate influence that of religious impressions, and the caste thus formed may have taken advantage of the importance it acquired to subject his descendants to the species of vassalage the monarchs are said to have been held by the priesthood.

Be this as it may, Egypt was to the Greeks the parent of their civilization, and the source of much of their mythology.

The people that dwelt on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris seem to have possessed an alphabetic writing at an early period. The remains which still exist in many parts of that country are marked with inscriptions in an arrow-headed character. Whatever may have been the capacity of this alphabet, it seems to have exercised no important influence on the literature or knowledge of Europe. The oldest of these inscriptions have not been deciphered, and seem to express the sounds of a language now wholly forgotten and lost; the more recent specimens are believed to be couched in the ancient Persian tongue. But the principle, resembling that of modern stenography, by which a single character became, when placed in different positions, expressive of different sounds, seems not to have been imitated by any more western nation.

It is in the hieroglyphics of the Egyptians that we are to seek the origin of all our modern alphabetic characters. Numerous in the extreme at first—for every name of a visible object furnished a character denoting its first articulation—we find them simplified and lessened in number in the successive forms of the hieratic and demotic mode of writing, until in the latter nearly every sound becomes restricted to a single symbol. A like principle applied to the Hebrew language gave rise to its alphabet, and to that of the Phenicians, which, using cognate tongues, gave the same names, and forms of like origin, to their letters. From the latter we can trace the direct derivation of the Cadmean letters, and of those of the Etrurians, and consequently of the alphabetic writing of Europe and much of Asia.

There is however a distinction to be drawn between the Phenician and Hebrew alphabets on the one hand, and those of Europe on the other. The former had no vowels, and the want of them has been supplied only in comparatively modern times; while the Greek alphabet had certainly, at a very early date, even if they were not a part of the system introduced by Cadmus, literal signs for a variety of vowel sounds.

To Egypt is the western part of the old continent also indebted for many of the arts of civilized life. The connection of the Greeks with that country at an early epoch is matter of history, and recent discoveries in Etruria have shown us tombs inscribed in the hieroglyphic character, which therefore prove

a similar communication. If, however, the Egyptians had any literature, or any science, they have either perished by the ravages of Cambyzes, or all trace of them has been lost in the lapse of time. It is then to the Greeks that we must refer for nearly all we know of the ancient world, except through the medium of the Scriptures, and we find them not merely the receivers and improvers of the knowledge of the Egyptians and Assyrians, but themselves in a great degree the original inventors of the sciences, and the earliest cultivators among the Gentile nations of any thing which has a title to be called literature. This nation furnishes to the physiologist the most instructive instance of the effect of a mixture of races in improving the powers, both mental and corporeal, of the human species, and to the politician, of the benign influence of freedom, even when paid for at the price of civil feuds, and almost continual warfare, in developing the energies of the mind of man.

It is no fiction that exhibits to us the early inhabitants of Greece as seeking a precarious subsistence from the nuts and acorns of the forests with which its surface was covered. Even when the Egyptian state had reached its most brilliant period; when Nineveh and Babylon swelled in the luxuries of social life; when Tyre covered the sea with her fleets, Greece, although partially benefitted by an intercourse and emigration from nations more advanced in civilization, retained or relapsed into its original barbarism. Yet when it did finally emerge, it assumed a rank unequalled in taste, in science, and in literature. The productions of the Grecian chisel still remain unrivalled; their architecture excels in taste that of any nation, whether ancient or modern; and to judge from the embellishments of obscure provincial towns, that have by a lucky accident reached us, their paintings must have exceeded even the best of the present era, as much as the sculptures of Phidias and Appollodorus are seen to excel those of Canova and Bernini.

The concurrent testimony of ancient historians shows an early race holding possessions in every part of Græce. This race is known to us by the name of Pelasgi.

It is very evident that even the most early of these historians had but vague ideas of the origin of this nation, and of its early seat. Some hold it to have been a wandering tribe, that made its first appearance in Arcadia, and thence migrating like the stork, occupied in rotation many parts of the European continent; while others expressly state that the Pelasgi never quitted their original seats. Modern critics, by the aid of methods unpractised by the ancients, by the comparison of the remains of arts, the relation and affiliation of languages, and the collation of the Greek historians with each other, have attained a knowledge

on this subject which leads to results far different from those which were received as authentic.

It has now been fully shown, by a combination of the most complete testimony, that the ancient inhabitants of Lydia, Caria, and Mysia, the Phrygians, Pisidians, and even the Armenians—in a word, nearly all the people of the Higher Asia—were in their origin identical with the Pelasgi. If to these we add the Pelasgic settlers in Italy, and in Rhætia, we must come to the conclusion, that at the earliest period to which we can carry back our views, there existed a nation paramount in its influence, from the borders of the Medes and Syrians on the one hand to those of the Celts on the other; and this nation was the same with that known as Pelasgic by the Greeks.

Throughout many of the countries that we have named, we still find the remains of structures of bold and stupendous plan, and laborious execution, precisely similar to those ascribed to the Pelasgi in Greece proper. Those of Italy are most familiarly known, and are distinguished by the epithet Cyclopean. These have been examined and illustrated by a countryman of our own,* and are among the most remarkable productions of human industry, of which we have any specimens. In the revolutions that occurred in subsequent times, the very recollection of this people was lost by those who were their own immediate descendants. Thus the Athenians ascribed the erection of the Cyclopean walls of their citadel to a wandering company of builders, natives of Tuscany, who were afterwards exiled by them to Lemnos; and yet Herodotus informs us that the Athenians were themselves Pelasgians by origin, and had never left their country.†

It is to the prevalence of this race in the countries which we have named, that we are to ascribe the analogy which exists among many of the languages that have been spoken in them, and particularly between the Greek and Latin. For it is very clear that, before the inhabitants of Greece had become Hellenic, all intercourse between that country and Latium had ceased, and indeed none had probably ever existed—the two Pelasgic tribes who occupied them having proceeded from some common source, and never again mingled.

It may be said that this idea, that the Pelasgic language furnished what was common to the tongues of the Greeks and Romans, is expressly contradicted by Herodotus, who says that the Pelasgi spoke a barbarous tongue; but it may well have been, that those who retained their ancient language unmixed, should have been unintelligible to those who had been so long

* Mr. J. I. Middleton.

† Herod. lib. i. cap. 56.

associated with a foreign race, that a new language had sprung from the amalgamation of the two dialects. Of this very fact we have a living instance. No one pretends to doubt that the English language is in its ground-work Anglo-Saxon, but that it has taken its present form by a combination with the Norman French. Now the Anglo-Saxon is at this moment spoken in the country whence England received it, and hardly differs from that of the court of Alfred. Yet the people who speak these two dialects, for strictly speaking they are no more, are utterly unintelligible to each other.

The Pelasgi, although probably the earliest ruling race in Greece, and certainly long the most important, were not the only one. The whole fabulous epoch of Grecian history is devoted to two families, sprung at a remote era from a common stock, but widely diversified in character, in feeling, in arts, and in religion. One of those had for its founder Inachus, the son of Oceanus; the other sprang from Deucalion. The family of the Inachidæ were unquestionably Pelasgi, and more than one of them bore that patronymic as a proper name. To Deucalion is referred the four branches of the Hellenic race, the Ionic, the Doric, the Achæan, the Æolic; and he is represented as the descendant of Japetus, the brother of Oceanus. In spite of the name of the latter, we cannot fail to see in this tradition the remnant of a true history that carries all the families of the human race to the children of Noah, of one of whom it is impossible to mistake the identity with Japetus.

Of these two races, one appears to have been barbarous, and to have at first yielded to the superior intelligence of the other. The Pelasgi had not only the skill in architecture of which we have already spoken, but possessed an alphabet, and were in the habit of using it in inscriptions, and this long anterior to the arrival of Cadmus, to whom the introduction of letters is usually ascribed. Of such use of letters we have direct testimony, in the account of the construction of a temple dedicated to a Phenician deity by a Pelasgic ruler of Sparta.

This temple is one of the most remarkable relics of antiquity, and was still existing in the middle of the last century, where it was seen and described by the Abbe Fourmont. It rests as a foundation upon three enormous blocks of stone, forming three steps, each about seventeen inches in height. Upon these are placed four stones, five feet in thickness, in a vertical position, that form the four walls of a chamber, sixteen feet in length by ten in breadth. The roof is also made of a single stone, on which two others rest, cut into a sloping surface, so as to form a truncated pyramid. Upon the front might still be read in ancient characters, "Eurotas, King of the Icteucretes, to Onga." This Onga is the same unquestionably with the Phenician goddess

Onca, brought by Cadmus to Thebes, and whom the later Greeks agreed to identify with the Neith or Minerva of Cecrops; and the name of Icteucretes was borne by the inhabitants of Laconia, until they assumed another from the nephew and successor of Eurotas.

Inachus is by many supposed to have been of Phenician origin. His course to Greece has been suspected to have been by sea. We should, however, rather infer that his road from the original seat of mankind was by the Hellespont or the Bosphorus, which the rudest means of transport would have sufficed to cross. In whatever manner Inachus entered Greece, there can be no doubt that he became the founder of the kingdom afterwards known by the name of Argos, and which formed the root of the Pelasgic part of the population of Greece. His sister, his sons, and their descendants, figure as the founders of Argos, Corinth, Sparta, and Mycenæ. The whole of Peloponesus, Thessaly, Epirus, and Attica, were included in the common name of Pelasgia, which in later days was restricted to some small cantons in Thessaly, where we find a Pelasgic Argos, retaining the epithet in contra-distinction to the other, which had become Hellenic.

In confirmation of this view of the subject, we find Argos called by Æschylus a Pelasgic city; the king of Argos, who grants a refuge to the daughters of Danaus, styles himself king of the Pelasgi, and describes his kingdom as comprehending a far more extensive region than that to which the name of Hellas was afterwards given, and to which we usually restrict the name of Greece.* He gives it for boundaries the mountains of Dodona, the canton of the Perrhæbi, the country of the Pæonians, who dwell beyond Pindus, and finally, the river Strymon. This Pelasgia, therefore, comprehended not only Greece proper, but a part of Epirus and Macedon.

Under the rule of Danaus, the name of Pelasgi merged in one obviously derived from his own; and Homer appears to have been acquainted with only two tribes that continued to bear the former, the one in Crete, the other in the Troad. Herodotus also cites two, but they are different from those of Homer, one in Mysia, on the borders of the Propontis, the other in the peninsula of which Mount Athos forms a part.

The Pelasgic race mixed, as we are informed, with the previous inhabitants of Greece, to whom they communicated some of the arts of social life, and whom they taught to reside in cities. Some portion, however, of this primitive people seems to have kept itself distinct, and to have occupied a small canton in Thessaly, known as the Phthiotis. A prince of this people, Prometheus, the father of Deucalion, for so we would translate

* See Freret in *Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscript.*

the fable, introduced among them the arts and knowledge of the Pelasgi, and thus prepared them for the prominent part they were thenceforward to take in the affairs of Greece. Yet some of them remained long essentially barbarians, and the sway of an unmixed tribe of this race carried back many parts of Greece to a state of rudeness, from which, under the dominion of the Pelasgi, it had long emerged.

In their mixture with the previous inhabitants, the Pelasgi must have lost their distinctive language, and one must have been made up of the union of the two, of a form such as we can doubtless still trace the remains in the *Æolic Greek*.

Other colonies however contributed to the formation of the people of Greece, and influenced their language and religion. The earliest of these are only known to us by the peculiar modes of worship which they introduced, and of which traces remained to the latest ages of pagan superstition.

The family of Inachus seem to have brought with them, as tutelary gods, Saturn or Cronos, and Juno. The former most probably a corrupt idea of the true divinity "the Ancient of Days;" the latter a Phenician deity, the queen of heaven, known on the shores of Syria and in various parts of Asia Minor, under different names, of which the Greeks afterwards made different deities. At no distant period from the advent of Inachus, Libyans, probably pirates, introduced the worship of Neptune, most likely a similar corrupt idea of the true god to the Cronos of the Inachidæ, but whom their maritime habits had invested with other attributes, and for whose supremacy they entered into a contest with the votaries of Saturn. Other deities were introduced by the colonies of which we are about to speak, and of which we have a more certain history.

First in the order of time is Cecrops, who landed in Attica. He was a native of Sais in Egypt, and brought with him the worship of the tutelar divinity of that place, the goddess Neith, who became the Athena of the Greeks. It is also said that he introduced into that province another form of the primeval tradition of a supreme deity under the name of Zeus, whom the Romans recognised as their Jupiter.

The name of Zeus has been identified with that of one of the gods of the second order in the Egyptian Pantheon. He was finally elevated in Greece to the highest rank, and in subsequent conquests of the Greeks they chose to consider the supreme divinity of the countries into which they penetrated as the same with their national god. Thus the Ammon of Egypt is best known to us by the prenomens of Jupiter, and the Belus of Babylon was worshipped by Alexander as another form of the same divinity.

Among other gifts, Cecrops brought with him the olive, and

another Egyptian colony that followed him to Attica after no long interval introduced the culture of the Cereal Gramina.

We place Cecrops first on our list, because we reject the tradition in respect to Ogyges as absolutely fabulous. The inundation that bears his name is one that could not possibly have occurred, and, with that said to have happened in the time of Deucalion, must be considered as no more than different versions of one anterior history, that of the deluge of Noah.

Much erudition has indeed been wasted in attempting to explain the causes of these two catastrophes, considered as distinct; but would classical scholars admit the evidence drawn from geological science, they would soon see how futile all such discussions are. It is therefore with great pleasure that we have seen Dr. Anthon quoting, when upon this subject, in his present edition, the authority of Cuvier, and abandoning to merited oblivion some of the fancies by which he had in his former ones been deluded.

Cadmus, a Phenician by birth, at no long distance of time from Cecrops, also departed from Egypt, and reached Bœotia. Here he became the founder of the citadel of Thebes. He is usually said to have introduced the alphabet into Greece, and he doubtless extended that employed by the Pelasgi, which had consisted of no more than sixteen letters.

A third Egyptian, Danaus, who had been driven from his country, and was probably the exiled brother of Sesostriis, directed his course to Argolis. Here he made himself master of the throne of Gelanor, a descendant of Inachus.

It cannot be doubted that these three colonies, arriving within a few years of each other, from a country at that time at the very height of its splendour, must have had a most marked influence on the Grecian character. Two of them acquired undisputed sway in the country whither they emigrated. The third, although even more famous in mythologic fable than either of the others, was not so fortunate. Orchomenus, a colony of the Thessalian Iolcos, long disputed pre-eminence with the city of Cadmus in Bœotia; and Cadmus himself was not permitted even to end his days in the citadel of his own foundation. The history of his last years is but little known, and it seems to have escaped the research of our author and his learned editor; we shall venture to give it.

Cadmus on his route left colonies at two of the Grecian islands, and first touched the continent in Thrace. At Rhodes he established a temple to the god of the seas, and performed sacrifices* to Onca, whom the Greeks afterwards considered as identical with Minerva. On leaving Thrace he entered the

* See Larcher, *Mem. de l'Academie des Inscip.*

Gulf of Crissa, and disembarked at Cirrha. The story of his consulting the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, his killing the dragon that guarded the fountain Aretias, the sowing of its teeth, and the armed crop that sprung therefrom, are trite and familiar. Under these legends are no doubt concealed the true events—that Cadmus was resisted in his attempt at settlement by the children of the soil, and succeeded only by exciting among them dissensions. In these, after much mutual slaughter, the survivors of one of the parties became subjects of Cadmus, and the other retired from the country.

There were in fact at the time Cadmus arrived in Bœotia, two distinct races that occupied its territory, the Aones and Hyantes. In these we cannot avoid recognising the Pelasgi, and the more early and rude aborigines. Of these the Aones remained in the vicinity of Thebes, while the Hyantes retired. The union of the Phenician followers of Cadmus with the Aones, appears to have been cemented by frequent intermarriages, until they formed but one people. In this people it appears that a revolt arose, by which Cadmus and his wife Harmonia were compelled to quit the city he had built. On leaving Thebes he sought refuge in Illyria, where his tomb existed for ages after in the neighbourhood of the place where Polu was afterwards founded. The first place in which he halted and founded a city was Buthoe, a maritime town of Dalmatia, which still retains its name almost unchanged. On a lake in the interior of the country he afterwards founded Lychnidus. In this country he met a people known by the name of Enchelians. To these he appears to have communicated some of the arts of social life, while he collected them in the cities we have named. In fine, according to the legend, he and his consort were changed into serpents, by which may perhaps be signified that in their union with the barbarians among whom they had sought refuge, they forsook the usages of the more civilized race from which they sprung. From his new seats, and by the aid of his new subjects, Cadmus made fruitless efforts to re-establish himself at Thebes. From this source however sprang an intercourse between the Thebans and Illyrians, and among the latter Laodamus, one of the descendants of Cadmus, retired, when driven from his throne by the Argive allies of the son of Polynices.

The next colony that made its way to Greece came from a very different quarter, and if it had less influence on the civilization of the inhabitants, it had more power to change the political state of the country.

In consequence of a war between Ilus, king of Phrygia, and Tantalus, the ruler of Sipylus, a town situated on the borders of Phrygia and Lydia, Pelops, the son of the latter, was compelled to abandon his country, and seek a new habitation for

himself and his subjects. Crossing the Hellespont he proceeded towards the Peloponesus, and on his way formed an alliance with the Achæans, a Hellenic tribe, then resident in Thessaly. Their united forces enabled them to obtain the ascendancy in many parts, not only of the peninsula, but in the provinces north of the Isthmus, and the memorial of his sway was indelibly marked in the name the peninsula thenceforward assumed.

The entrance of Pelops was made on the western side of the peninsula, and he fortified himself there by an alliance, by marriage, with the daughter of the king of Elis, to whose throne he at first succeeded. Atreus, his son, acquired the united kingdoms of Mycenæ and Tirynthus, at the death of Eurystheus; these he left to his eldest son Agamemnon. The latter reduced the king of the ancient Sicyon and the Ægialus, while his brother Menelaus obtained the throne of Sparta as the dowry of his wife.

In this way the descendants of Pelops obtained a preponderating influence in the affairs of Greece, holding several of its kingdoms as their own, receiving homage from the rulers of others as vassals, and bearing to the other conquerors, the Achæans, the relation of chiefs of the league by which the conquest was effected.

At the time of the war of Troy, there existed in Greece fifty-one states of some degree of importance, forty-five of which figure in the catalogue of Homer, and six more are enumerated by Pausanias. Of these, thirty-four had already acknowledged the rule of the Hellenic race. The Pelasgi retained but one principality in the Peloponesus, that of Arcadia; but in Thessaly, the Myrmidons, a Pelasgic race, exercised the same authority that the Pelopidæ did in the peninsula.

Among these kingdoms, that of the Dorians, who afterwards filled so great a space in the affairs of Greece, does not make its appearance. Of these thirty-four Hellenic kingdoms, a part had been formed by the descendants of Amphietyon, and under the influence of the league that bore his name. Other leagues were formed upon the same principle, until they amounted in all to six.

The other Hellenic dynasties were founded by the Achæan allies of Pelops, or by another branch of the tribe, which possessed the Ægialus, and became afterwards incorporated with the Pelasgi of Attica. But even as late as the time of Homer the name of Hellenes had not become common to the whole of the Greeks, as it did in after times. We must indeed say, that we conceive that story which draws the four races of Dorians, Ionians, Achæans, and Æolians, from descendants of Deucalion, who became the progenitors of these families, as fictitious, and as formed at a later day, to account for the diversity of language

and habits that characterized portions of the Grecian people. In support of this view of the subject, we would state, that Herodotus speaks of the Dorians as a nation in the time of Deucalion, and points out their residence.*

Were it not that we were trammelled by what is usually received as authentic history, we should incline to the opinion that these Dorians of Herodotus were the original subjects of Deucalion, the remnant of the primitive inhabitants of Greece, who had preferred liberty among the fastnesses of Olympus, to the civilization and rule of the Pelasgi; that successive swarms of these barbarians, beginning with the followers of Amphictyon, had returned to their original country, where, partly by force and partly by adoption, they had assumed various relations, from that of royal authority to that of servitude; that in these varied relations they had modified, in a greater or less degree, the language of the states in which they settled, and had thus given birth to many dialects. The polish and elegance of these dialects bore an inverse ratio to the influence of the Hellenic race from that of Athens, in which they never acquired any important influence, to that of Sparta, where the original inhabitants were reduced to actual slavery.

In naming this last instance we are in some measure forestalling the order of time; for a portion of the Hellenes remained in their original seats, until, joining themselves to the Heraclidæ, they burst into Peloponesus, expelling not only the descendants of Atreus, but also the Achæan and Ionian dynasties.

In obtaining their paramount influence in the Peloponesus, the Phrygian race of the Atridæ, and their Achæan allies, seem to have acted with a wise and moderate policy. They made no forced alterations in the manners, the customs, and the religion of the states over which they acquired a sway. Nay, so far as the Phrygians were concerned, they probably added the more advanced civilization of Asia to that already introduced by the Phenician and Egyptian settlers. We may therefore conceive that the reign of Agamemnon saw the inhabitants of Greece in a state of power, refinement, and prosperity, they had never before attained. This power and prosperity were much impaired by the waste of life and treasure which were expended upon the war of Troy, in which the descendant of Pelops amply retaliated upon the race of Ilus, the exile of his progenitor.

Such a state of exhaustion might have been recovered from in the course of nature, but it laid the country open to the Dorian conquest. This fierce and barbarous race, who seem to have been considered too insignificant to be mentioned by Homer, ranked themselves, as we have already stated, under the banners

* Herod. lib. i. cap. 56.

of the Heraclidæ, whom they succeeded in restoring to the royal seats of their ancestor. But this restoration being most strenuously resisted, gave rise to cruel and destructive wars, which ended in the exile of a large proportion of the best of the population, and the slavery of the remainder.

We have spoken only of the Dorians as the supporters of the Heraclidæ, and the instruments by which the conquest of the Peloponesus was effected. But this invasion included other tribes, and was directed to other objects, and, by their union, the face not only of the peninsula, but of the whole of Greece, was changed.

At the same instant in which the Heraclidæ assailed the Peloponesus, the Cadmeans, who had been driven from Thebes, effected their return, and resumed the rule of that city by the aid of another Hellenic tribe, the Æolians of Arné; and the Thesprotians, who, if not Hellenic in origin, had become identified with that race in manners and customs, destroyed the Pelasgic kingdom of the Myrmidons in Thessaly. In the whole of Greece but one state remained, that of Arcadia, which did not receive Hellenic masters. Even Athens, by becoming the refuge of the Ionians driven from the Peloponesus, whether under the influence of force, or, as is more probable, to aid it against a Doric invasion, lost its distinctive Pelasgic Egyptian character, and chose itself a king from among the exiles. Finally, Salamis, the last hold of Pelasgic power, fell under the rule of the Athenians.

The first consequence of these convulsions was to extend the name of Hellas to the whole of Greece, and that of Hellenes to all its inhabitants. Strabo,* citing Apollodorus as his authority, fixes the date of this change. "Homer gives the name of Hellenes to the Thessalians alone. But Hesiod and Archilochus were acquainted with this name as well as that of Panhellenes, and applied them to the entire nation." Thus, at a distance of about three hundred years from the Dorian conquest, the invaders had impressed their name upon the conquered people, and the country they occupied.

The works of Homer give an account, that bears unquestionable evidence of authenticity, of the state of Greece at the time of the war of Troy, a state of glory and wealth to which his Ionian compatriots must have often referred with sad, yet pleasing recollections. Divided into a great number of small states, each ruled by a petty sovereign, it acknowledged in the south the paramount influence of the Atridæ, and in the north that of the Pelidæ. The connexions of the former were the most extensive, and seem to have influenced the politics of the latter, for

* Lib. viii.

in no other way can we account for the entrance of Achilles into a league apparently contrary to his own interest and personal affections. Thus he could not have been a zealous co-operator, except when under the excitement of his passions; and his withdrawal from the war is probably no fiction, although its assigned cause may have existed only in the imagination of the poet.

At this epoch all the inhabitants of the Greek islands of the Peloponesus, of Central Greece, and of Thessaly, with the exception of the Dorians and Æolians of Arné, were well acquainted with the art of agriculture, which was considered so honourable, that the most distinguished citizens did not disdain to practise it. They had also erected numerous cities and walled towns, in which they exercised many of the mechanic arts; they possessed a naval force, and carried on a maritime commerce. Each state was ruled by a monarch, succeeding in the order of legitimacy, but possessing no more than a limited authority. The king commanded the armies, and exercised functions both executive and judicial; he also held the first place in the ceremonies of religion; but he was unable to perform any legislative act, or make any important decision, without the consent of the people. Each state was made up of a principal city, and a number of others of less importance. The direct sway of the king of the state extended only to the first of these, while each of the inferior towns had its own hereditary chief magistrate and separate government. In the same manner that one city thus exercised a tempered influence over its less important neighbours, a greater state affected the weaker ones in its vicinity. Adscription to the soil was then unknown, and in the absence of such compulsory service, we find persons of the highest rank performing offices almost of a menial character. If domestic slavery existed, it appears to have been confined to captives in war, and even then not to have been tolerated in respect to Greeks.

The cities were generally erected in places where the natural strength of position might aid in their defence, and even in the maritime regions were always at some distance from the sea, in order to save them from insult or capture by sudden invasion. The cities and walled towns were intended to accommodate and protect the whole of the inhabitants, for even those engaged in agricultural pursuits had their residence in the neighbouring fortress. They were thus multiplied excessively, inasmuch that Laconia, which after the Dorian conquest boasted only of the open city of Sparta, with less than forty towns of inferior note, bore, in ancient times, the name of Hecatompolis, from its hundred fortresses. Of these cities, Homer names upwards of one hundred and fifty; to fifteen of these he gives epithets that denote size, strength, riches, and excellence of build-

ing. The latter were very unequally distributed over the surface of the country; thus, of the fifteen, nine are to be found in the Peloponesus alone, while Thessaly contained but one, and Central Greece no more than four. The walls of some of these cities have come down to our day, and are still to be discerned. Their more ancient parts exhibit stones broken into the form of irregular polygons, jointed and fitted with great nicety, while upon these, as foundations, lie horizontal courses, in regularly squared blocks. To the former of these methods of building the epithets Pelasgic and Cyclopean have been given; the latter method was probably introduced from Asia by Pelops. Of the latter, the most remarkable instances now extant are, the gate of Mycenæ, and the building that Clarke seems to have identified as the tomb of Agamemnon; while of the former, the walls of Tiryns still assert their worthiness to give an epithet to the hero who excelled in strength all others of the human race.

Of the useful arts, Homer speaks of mining, and reducing gold, silver, iron and copper; these the Greeks of his day knew how to forge, to cast, to engrave and to emboss. In addition, they understood how to spin, to weave, to embroider and dye on linen and wool, and to execute works of statuary in wood and ivory. Of these, the fabric and embellishment of cloth rested in the hands of the female sex, and was the pride of ladies of the highest rank.

This state of civilization was much impaired by the convulsions that attended the return of the Heraclidæ; but the different parts of Greece were very unequally affected. The fugitives from the Peloponesus who took refuge in Attica, were probably themselves in a state of civilization little inferior to its ancient inhabitants. The conquest of Elis was not followed by the exile of any of its people or their reduction to slavery. On the other hand, the Thessalians, who seized upon the whole of Thessaly, reduced its other inhabitants to the state of *adscripti glebæ*, or of actual slavery, imposing upon them the exercise of agriculture and the mechanic arts for the benefit of their masters, who applied themselves to no other profession than that of arms. The conquerors of Bœotia entirely destroyed the commerce of that country, once the most flourishing of Greece, ruined its agriculture by the neglect of the outlet of the lake Copais, and changed the ancient fame of the country as the seat of letters and poesy, to the character of being the most stupid and illiterate of all Greece. In Argolis, Mycenæ and Tiryns, once the most important cities of Greece, were blotted from its map; the few inhabitants of Laconia who escaped with their lives were either deprived of all civil rights, or were reduced to a slavery so cruel, that the very term of Helot expresses to the present day a state of the most degra-

ding servitude; Messene, used even more cruelly, finally became a desert waste.

Such were the consequences of the return of the Heraclidæ; nor did the people of Greece speedily resume the civilization they were thus deprived of, or regain the wealth and power they had previously possessed. Six centuries appear to have elapsed before any new impulse was given to the sciences and the useful arts. These were carried by the emigrants to the coast of Asia Minor, whence they reflected back upon European Greece the knowledge and taste which had cheered their exile.

A dark age of several centuries followed these convulsions, and literature and the arts did not re-appear until about the epoch of the Persian invasion. From that time the history of Greece is a matter of universal knowledge.

The religion of Greece is a subject of no common interest. Absurd as were its dogmas, and gross as were the practices and superstitions connected with or arising from them, it became in the hands of their poets a source of the most beautiful imagery. The passages of the authors who speak of their deities yield only in sublimity to the sacred writings; and by a most extraordinary effort of genius, we see imaginary beings, admitted to be of human origin and soiled with worse than human vices, invested not merely with dignity, but clothed with the most imposing majesty.

Superior even to the highest of them we find the action of an overruling and irresistible fate, against which neither human exertion nor the most anxious desires of the gods themselves can avail, and to which even the ruler of Olympus is compelled to bow. The throne of the father of the gods is surrounded with other powerful beings, each acting as a deity to certain places and persons, or presiding over some of the varied pursuits and passions of the human race. In just and regular gradation succeed to these the divinities of the earth and the ocean, until every fountain and every stream, every tree and every grove, attests the presence of its tutelary god.

This system of polytheism has by some been supposed to be the work of the poets themselves, and they have been represented as actually creating the religion whose tenets are expounded in their writings. But this opinion is untenable, for it would have been impracticable for any individual, however great his genius, to overturn an ancient system of religion and establish a new one, unless he had claimed the authority of a divine mission, and had his claim allowed by his compatriots. To such authority neither Homer nor Hesiod laid any claim, and if they have engrafted any of their own fancies upon the superstitions of their contemporaries, these additions would

have been but few in number and unimportant in character. Their writings however had the effect of fixing the religious belief of their descendants, and thus the theogony of Hesiod, with but little addition, formed the standard of faith, not only in Greece itself, but in all the countries in which it acquired influence either by force of arms or superiority of intellect, until the cumbrous system of polytheism gave way to the benign influence of the Christian doctrine.

The religion of Greece reached the form in which even the most ancient writers represent it, by gradual steps. Its first savage inhabitants, according to Herodotus, offered sacrifices to the gods, and adored them without assigning to any of them a particular epithet, because no one had yet taught them their names; they called them simply gods,* because they had placed all things in the universe, and established them in admirable order. Plato ascribes to them the most ancient form of idolatry. "The ancient inhabitants of Greece, as well as many other barbarous people, had no other gods but the sun, the moon, the earth, the stars, and the heavens." According to Herodotus, however, and he as the more ancient authority is to be preferred, they only learned to give names to the deities from the foreign colonies that settled among them. Each of the various swarms of which we have spoken, brought with it its own peculiar mode of worship, which it established in the seats that it acquired. The more early inhabitants were either unable to cope with the new comers, or received them with hospitality. In either case they, or at least a part of them, united themselves to the colonists, and formed with them from that time one and the same people; they recognised the chiefs of the several expeditions as their kings and legislators; they were taught to construct houses and combine them in cities; they collected animals and accustomed them to be domestic; finally, they received the gift of the cereal gramina, and learned the practice of agriculture. At the same time they learned to bow with them at the same altars, and gladly recognised the gods of those to whom they owed the arts of social life, as more powerful than those they had hitherto worshipped.

On the arrival of the later colonies the ground was found already occupied, and even where they obtained a settlement, it was rarely without a contest, as much owing to diversity in religious faith, as to any other circumstance. So also contests in respect to the supremacy of their several divinities must have arisen between the citizens of neighbouring states. The early mythology of Greece is full of legends which demonstrate these facts, and in them the deities themselves often figure as actors

* Θεοι: ὅτι κόσμον θέτες τὰ πάντα πρῶματα.—Herod. lib. ii. cap. 52.

instead of their sectaries. Such is the fable of the war of the Titans, and such the more recent conflict that attended the introduction of the worship of Bacchus.

Saturn and Juno appear to have been the first of the deities who were introduced into Greece. These were the gods of Inachus and his family.

Saturn, or Cronos, was a Phenician deity, known under the titles of Moloch and Baal. His rites were bloody, and demanded human sacrifice; these were offered at his shrine, and prevailed not only in the well-known colonies of Tyre, but wherever the Pelasgi penetrated, although they were in the change of superstitions, offered up to deities of other names. In Rome they were not abolished until as late a date as ninety-four years before Christ.*

Phoroneus, the descendant of Inachus, placed the city of Argos, which he built, under the protection of Juno, or Here. This deity is also believed to be of Phenician origin, and the same with Astarte, the queen of heaven. If this be so, her rites, coming with variations through three different channels, gave birth to three different goddesses of the Greek Pantheon.

The mountains of the island of Crete are visible from the coast of Libya, and from the former the continent of Greece is discernible. The settlements of the Inachidæ were soon disturbed by natives of Africa, who followed the route thus pointed out by nature. These were probably pirates by profession, but did not disdain to seek permanent abodes in the Peloponesus. They brought with them the worship of the god of the seas under whose protection they had traversed the dangerous passage. The conflicting claims of this last named god and of the original Penates of Inachus, gave birth to violent contests, which ended in the acknowledged supremacy of Saturn and Juno. The worship of Neptune was however established in Attica, where it prevailed until the arrival of Cecrops, and was never wholly extinct in the Peloponesus.

The honours of Neptune were maintained by the Telchini, probably a sacerdotal cast, and in the support of the rites of their divinity they made war upon the son of Phoroneus, who perished in the conflict; but they were finally quelled by his successor.

The worship of Jupiter, as has been stated, is spoken of in the history of Cecrops. We should however doubt the accuracy of this tradition, as it also certainly reached Greece by the same road as that of Neptune had travelled, at an earlier date. His priests, the Dactyli Idæi, proceeded from Crete, and bore with them the rites of the divinity who was afterwards to rule

* Pliny, xxxi., quoted by Freret.

paramount in Olympus. These missionaries made their most successful impression upon the barbarous people who became the subjects of Deucalion. These they laboured to form into communities, and taught them to reverence Zeus. They also seem to have established the oracle of Apollo at Delphi.

An ancient tradition, transmitted to us by Virgil, intimates that Troy had received a part of its population from Crete; by this connection these modes of worship were borne into Phrygia, and the hostile dynasties of Argos and Ilium were taught to bow to the same divinities. The fable that makes Jupiter a native of Crete, is therefore no more than the veiled image of the origin of this superstition.

Under the influence of the votaries of Jupiter, human blood gradually flowed less frequently upon the altars, as it was considered abhorrent to him. Still, however, it was impossible wholly to eradicate the practice, which remained in force wherever the pure Pelasgic race retained its authority. Thus Achilles is represented as offering human sacrifices, although this was so repugnant to the feelings of the rest of the Grecian army, that they are requested to withdraw from the horrid rite.

Even the pure Pelasgi of Thessaly, however, learned to venerate Jupiter, and erected temples to him. Pelops, therefore, on his arrival in Greece, found certainly in Thessaly the followers of his own religious faith, the Achæan worshippers of Jupiter, and probably the Myrmidons.

This may have formed no small motive for their alliance against the rulers of Peloponesus, if the latter, as is probable, retained the ancient faith, while the mass of the people may have gladly received a less cruel mode of worship. We cannot, however, but believe that we are to ascribe to this confederacy the final prevalence of the worship of Jupiter among the Greeks. It seems probable that, in their early and feeble efforts, the Dactyli may have represented their Zeus as the son of Cronos; the latter, therefore, was, upon the final triumph of the votaries of the former, represented as dethroned by his own son.

Still the ancient divinity, if dethroned, did not wholly lose the respect of men. In the very sight of the most sacred temple of his successor, sacrifices were annually offered to his name, and a chapel of the neglected Cronos was actually included in the circuit of the temple of the Olympian Jupiter at Athens.

The Egyptian colony of Cecrops brought, as we have seen, one of the divinities of their country, the goddess Neith. On the shore of the ancient Acte they found the altars of Neptune. Which should be received as the supreme object of adoration, does not appear to have been settled without a struggle. The remembrance of this is still retained in the account of the strife

of the two divinities, and in this the introduction of the olive figures.

Cadmus also venerated the same goddess, under the name of Onca, and the Pelasgi of Laconia erected a temple to the goddess Onga, who is identical with the Æthena of the Cecropian city. But the name of Cadmus is more intimately connected with the orgies of Bacchus. This god is by all identified with Osyris, but was honoured with different ceremonies from that Egyptian divinity. An avatar of Bacchus was planned in the family of Cadmus himself, and the new worship was propagated by force of arms.

Isis also passed from Egypt into Greece. Attica first received her worship under the name of Demeter or Ceres, from a second Egyptian colony which introduced, at the same time, the cultivation of the useful plants, that still bear the name of the Cereal gramina. Associated thus with the greatest temporal blessing ever conferred upon the human race, the honours of Ceres made their way along with the seeds of her imagined gift into every part of Greece; and from every quarter the first fruits of the grain were annually transmitted to Attica, in token of gratitude for the valued bounty.

Such were the sources whence the Greeks derived their most honoured divinities. Still, in receiving them, they departed widely from the names and attributes borne by them in the country of their origin. In Phenicia the deities bore material figures, but they were unlike the human form, and were believed to represent beings higher in origin than man. Egypt admitted an affiliation of divinity, and acknowledged three orders of gods, the last of which, if of divine original, had lived and acted among mortals, and were hence represented under human figures.

At the head of their list of gods, and first in the highest order, they are said to have placed one without name or figure, incorporeal, immutable, and infinite, who was to be adored in silence as the supreme creator and principle of all things. After him seven other gods, of whom the first was engendered by him, and who, in their turn, had given birth each to the other by successive emanations. These were in regular order: 1st, *Knef*, also known as Ammon, and represented under human form, but with the head of a ram; 2d, *Matter*, or the sensible world; 3d, *Athor*, or the celestial Venus; 4th, *Phta*, the Hephaistos or Vulcan of the Greeks; 5th, *Pan*; 6th, *Phre*, or the Sun; 7th, *Pi Joh*, or the Moon. The two last divinities figure as the leaders of the gods of the second order, who obey them as their king and queen. Six males follow the Sun, viz: *Rempha*, *Pi Zeus* (the Zeus of the Greeks), *Artes* (Ares or Mars), *Surot*, *Pi Hermes* (or Mercury), *Uranus* (or the heaven of the stars). The

third order of divinities are supposed to have figured upon the earth, although not of mortal origin, and among these are numbered Osiris and Isis, to whom the attributes of the two last gods of the first order were also assigned, and Horus or Apollo. The Greeks, on the other hand, ascribed a mortal descent almost to all the divinities they received. They even pointed out the place and fixed the date of their nativity. To some, as in the case of Jupiter, the country whence their name was imported into Greece was considered as that of their birth and parentage; others again were said to have Grecian mothers but divine fathers, and the time and place of their nativity became the same as that of the first introduction of their worship.

The religion of Greece, therefore, received a character almost wholly material. It indeed admitted of beings more powerful than man, who presided over the government of the universe. But this universe was not of their creation, and sprang from the union of chaos and night. Nor was even the most powerful of the gods a free agent, or capable of exerting his own good pleasure. Jupiter was controlled by an irresistible fate, over which he had no influence, and there were occasions on which men could successfully oppose his decrees, and prevent them from being accomplished. Nay, as Jupiter had acquired his authority by force, it was not considered impossible that he might in his turn be dethroned, and a new divinity reign in his stead.

This habit of considering their deities as material beings had so far disqualified the mass of the people of Greece for understanding the possibility of the existence of an intelligent being, differing wholly in essence from matter, that the first ideas of mind that were proposed to them were received with ridicule; while so abhorrent was such an idea to the sense of the vulgar, that those who held it were speedily persecuted as corruptors of the religion of the state.

Under the influence of the various colonies, and of the contests between the votaries of different divinities, each city and district acquired its peculiar tutelary god, and it even appears probable, that rarely more than one was at first honoured in a particular place. These deities had, at first, their priests, in the form of distinct castes or sacerdotal families, and it cannot be doubted that wars and bloodshed must have arisen from their zeal for the extension of their respective modes of worship. Of these, it has been seen that we have the remembrance preserved in various mythological fables.

It seems that Pelops and his allies did not disturb the religious rites which they found existing, even where they differed from their own, if we except the bloody rites of Saturn, so abhorrent to the dictates of nature; but in the various states and

confederations formed by them, and by the Amphictyonic leagues, the deities of separate cities and regions were received as common to the whole. The kings skilfully assumed to themselves the character of priests, not of any particular god, but of all recognized by the state; and so artfully and completely was this union of the royal power with religion effected, that in the establishment in subsequent times, even of the most pure democracies, a titular king was still retained to perform those parts of the religious ceremonies which had formerly been the prerogative of the ruler of the state. By this sage policy the sacerdotal families lost their political influence; but they did not cease to exist, nor to retain to themselves, in many places, the hereditary priesthood of individual deities.

Polytheism, in its most extensive aspect, became then the religion of Greece, and each individual was left free to choose the objects of his worship, provided he found no fault with a similar liberty in others, and avoided interference with the received religion of the state.

The amalgamation of the worship of particular deities into one established religion, in which each of them retained its own rites and peculiar honours, gave birth to the fables of the affiliation and descent of the gods. Jupiter, as has already been stated, had probably been represented, on the first appearance of his votaries in Greece, as the son of that supreme divinity who was acknowledged at the time. Neptune, although known long before the sectaries of Jupiter made their appearance, was said to be his brother; and Minerva, also probably more ancient, the offspring of his brain. In general terms he became the father of most of the other gods, and when their worship was subsequently imported, the date of their birth was often made to correspond with the time of its introduction. Thus Vulcan, who is identified with one of the great gods of Egypt, although still acknowledged in Greece as of immortal birth, is degraded to a low place and made of recent origin in the Greek Pantheon. The tendency to materialism was taken advantage of to plan *avatars* of the deity to be introduced in the families of persons of extensive influence. Thus the worship of Osyris became consecrated to one of the family of Cadmus, and the acts and exploits of the Tyrian Hercules were ascribed to the son of Alcmena, although the altars of the former had smoked from Sidon to Gades for ages before the birth of the latter.

Such frauds having been found successful, they were practised to save the honour of distinguished families, whose daughters gave to their illegitimate offspring the epithet of the sons of the gods, and in this extensive office of paternity, Jupiter was made to figure before all the others.

So also those who first undertook settlements in lands where

the religion of Greece was yet unknown, assumed the character of sons of divinities. The system was even carried farther; princes, who had offspring by females of an origin so low that they could not venture to acknowledge them to their subjects, introduced their spurious issue as the sons of goddesses, who might not be free from the frailties of which the male deities were admitted to be guilty.

In this way was ingrafted upon a system originally material and gross, a series of licentious fables, until the inhabitants of Olympus became, in the legends of the times, monsters of lust and incontinence. The artifice of ascribing an immortal parent to the offspring of clandestine intercourse became at last too stale to be any longer successful; nor even when undetected, did it always succeed in giving to the subjects of the apotheosis it operated, the honours of their foreign prototype. Thus the Hercules of Greece, although assuming the labours and wanderings of the supreme divinity of Tyre, was barely tolerated as a deified mortal in the country of his nativity.

Upon the subject of the origin of the deities of Greece, we cannot do better than quote the words of the Abbé Foucher.

"The early Greeks were polytheists, that is to say, besides a sovereign god they recognized subaltern divinities, the ministers of the most high in the government of the universe. A belief in genii, superior to man in wisdom, belongs to all times and all countries; but the people of Greece insensibly formed too elevated an idea of their greatness and power; they made of them the sons of gods, the emanations of light; they participated in the divine nature, and passed as gods of the second order.

"The Greeks, no doubt, like other people, placed among these gods of the second rank, the sun, the moon, the stars, the earth, the elements, and all the great agents of nature, whether because they believed them to be directed by celestial beings, or regarded the vital and igneous spirit with which they appeared animated, as the substance of the divinity himself, shed abroad throughout the world to give motion to all its parts. It has been an universal belief that God is omnipresent, but there is no religious maxim that has been more grossly abused.

"If the religion of the early Greeks was simple, its exterior rites were even more so; they had neither temples nor consecrated buildings; they offered to the gods fruits and animals; their place of worship was a plain, a mountain, or a grove.

"Such was the religion that the Greeks abandoned to run after a crowd of new divinities hitherto unknown to them. They adopted, with a sort of madness, the most incredible, the most senseless, the most revolting fables; if they gained on the side of civilization, and in the establishment of a social spirit, they lost

more on the side of religion; that which they embraced presented to them absurd ideas, scandalous adventures, and practices destructive of morals; the example of the gods belied the wisdom of the laws."

He then comments thus upon the passages of Herodotus we have before quoted.

"Our historian adds that even the names of the divinities of Greece came from Egypt. 'Almost all the names of the gods,' says he, 'have come from Egypt into Greece, and I have verified the fact in relation to what I had heard, that they were received from the barbarians; but I think they are more particularly from Egypt.'

"It is to be desired that Herodotus had informed us in what manner he had made this verification; we can indeed see some conformity between the Egyptian and Greek names of some of the divinities. Pan is a name that may have passed unaltered from the Egyptian to the Greek; Vulcan (Hephaistos) is probably the Egyptian Phta. The same names are given to Latona or Hercules, whether they are spoken of as Greek or Egyptian divinities; but what relation is there between Ammon and Zeus, Osiris and Dionysius, Horus and Apollo, Babastis and Artemis, Thoth and Hermes.

"It would however be rash to give a positive denial to the assertion of our historian. Although he was aware as well as we are, that these names of gods had no sensible resemblance, he does not the less assure us, after mature examination, that the names of the gods have come from Egypt rather than any other nation. In the Greek we find words of Phenician origin, because we know the Syrian and Hebrew languages; we would also doubtless find Egyptian etymologies, if we knew that language. We have however of the Coptic a sufficient vocabulary to serve as terms of comparison, and we have reason to believe this to be a remnant of the primitive idiom. In it may be seen so marked a relation to many Greek words, as to cause us to suspect that it has had more influence than is usually believed upon the Greek tongue, and particularly upon the names of the gods.

"Without entering into this difficult discussion, in which I myself should be a novice, I shall content myself with some general observations, that must in my opinion justify the assertion of Herodotus.

"1. The names of the Egyptian and Phenician gods being all significative, each divinity had several, because one alone would not express all the attributes; among these names the Greeks would have chosen that which they found most analogous to their mode of thinking and speaking, although this may not have been the most usual or the proper name of the god

they adopted. Of this we have a striking instance in Adonis. He was a Syrian deity of the name of Thammus, whose adventures the Greeks engrafted on their mythology. There is however no relation between the two names, but the Syrians in the rites of Thammus called him *Adonai* or lord, and the Greeks laying hold of this title of honour called him Adonis.

"2. Even if the names of the Greek divinities had not been Egyptian words Hellenized, it is sufficient to show their Egyptian origin if the Greeks had translated in the terms of their own language, the signification of the Egyptian names, or even if, without stopping at the internal value of the names, they had invented new ones to express the idea they had formed to themselves of the foreign divinities they adopted. For instance, the Greeks had heard the Egyptians say that Osiris was the son of Ammon, who had been brought up at Nysa; in adopting this divinity they gave him a name that included these two facts, styling him Dionysus. Isis in like manner was often clothed by the Egyptians with the attributes of the earth, the nursing mother of all that has life; the Greeks in giving to this goddess the name of Demeter, translated exactly this Egyptian idea; and this is perhaps what Herodotus means when he assures us that Osiris rendered into Greek is Dionysus, and Isis is Demeter.

"3. Finally, it is incontestible that those of the ancient nations who had connections with each other by vicinity or commerce, reciprocally communicated their divinities and religious ceremonies; but these divinities, in passing to a new country, did not preserve there the names they bore in that of their origin. Who can doubt for instance that the communication between Egypt and Phenicia was frequent? and the conformity of the adventures and rites of Osiris and Thammus, prove that they were one and the same, although their names appear to have no relation to each other.

"We know, in addition, that the Latins derived from the Greeks their Saturn, their Jupiter, their Pluto, their Juno, their Ceres, their Proserpine, their Minerva, their Diana, their Venus, their Mercury; but these names are not those of the Greek divinities, or at least not those in most common use. It is not easy to assign any good reason for such a difference, but this proves nothing against an identity that is so thoroughly established."

The discussions into which we have entered have occupied so much space, that we shall not detain our readers by exhibiting specimens of our editor's style. We might, indeed, quote many passages, not merely for the learning and research they exhibit, but as possessing much even of popular interest. In the absence of extracts we may refer to the work itself, where

those who wish to see Dr. Anthon in the most favourable light, will find, in the article on Egypt, perhaps the very best abstract from the original and select modern authorities, of all that is known in relation to that country, which has yet appeared in any language. As a contrast to the judgment and ability with which this is drawn up, we may cite the carelessness with which, in the article *Hercules*, he has adopted the worse than fanciful reveries of the Dupuis, and the many passages in which he has admitted the fabled antiquity of Indian civilization, so fully refuted by Herodotus, Strabo, and Arrian, and so contradictory to the curious and rarely cited facts that he has himself given us on the authority of Bayer in the article *Bactria*.

Copious as the Classical Dictionary is in the number of its articles, interesting as are its subjects to all who pretend to education, a single review can give no idea of its merits. These we have been compelled to acknowledge merely in general terms. If, as impartial critics, we have felt it our duty to mention a few defects; or if in our own investigations we have occasionally reached results very different from those attained by him, these have been cited in no unfriendly spirit, and our remarks may, we hope, rather stimulate him to persevere in the career he has so successfully begun, than tend to discourage him in his learned labours.

ART. III.—*An Inquiry into the State of Slavery amongst the Romans; from the earliest period till the establishment of the Lombards in Italy.* By WILLIAM BLAIR, Esq. Edinburgh, 1833. One volume, 12mo.

WE have no intention of treating the question of domestic slavery at present. Many of our former pages have been devoted to this all important topic—both sides of the discussion have been fully and fairly exhibited; and our southern brethren (for to them principally the adverse arguments have been addressed,) can decide for themselves upon views dictated by a sincere desire to promote their welfare, and, as connected with theirs, the welfare of the whole union. As an abstract topic, however,—we mean, by abstract, disconnected with the question of emancipation in the United States,—slavery and its modes of existence in other countries, considered in themselves, and with relation to its condition in our own, are objects of prominent interest.

No one can object to the shedding of additional light upon

the topic of slavery, if it be in the power of any so to do. The student of nature in the highest effort of her creation, man, who is anxious to survey as well the exhibition of his lowest vices as of his exalted virtues, will peruse with deep concern the record of the abject slavery which the hand of man has imposed on his fellow—a slavery not alone of the body, but one which, denying to its victim the lights of learning and religion, has shut out the sources of the purest earthly enjoyments, and endeavoured, at least, to close the door of that resting-place beyond the grave, which the divine founder of our faith has vouchsafed to our hopes. To know human nature, we must become acquainted with her in her worst as well as in her bright features; and the fact of the existence of the evil we are considering, introduces us, unfortunately, at once to a view of her darkest traits.

A comparison, however slight, of ancient and modern slavery, cannot fail to possess interest. The little book, for which we are indebted to the learning and industry of Mr. Blair, furnishes us with the means of instituting this comparison, as far as ancient Rome is concerned. We have rarely met with a work which, in so small a compass, comprises as much erudition and research. All the facts upon the subject, which are scattered through various unconnected authorities, are combined and presented to the reader in a pleasing and not too technical form. We have only to regret that our author's time did not allow him to dilate more than he has done upon the mass of valuable materials he has thus collected. This necessarily embraces much new matter, or rather, much that is not generally known. To the student of Roman history, particularly, the volume of Mr. Blair offers a rich treat, and to such we commend its perusal. It presents a view of an important chapter in the great history of slavery; whose records, unhappily, are almost identical with those of our race.

It might, at first, be supposed, (and our author in his preface has alluded to the supposition,) that nothing of novelty could be presented with regard to the Roman people. The remark of Dr. Johnson would at once suggest itself, that they are a nation "who, above all others, have furnished employment to the studious, and amusement to the idle; who have scarcely left behind them a coin or a stone, which has not been examined and explained a thousand times, and whose dress, food and household stuff, it has been the pride of learning to understand." Yet it will be found upon examination, that with the exception of the work under review, the two papers of M. de Burigny in the *Memoirs of the French Academy of Inscriptions* (vol. 35, p. 328, and vol. 37, p. 313), furnish almost the only detailed view of the subject of Roman slavery given in modern times

—and these present but a slight sketch. We therefore intend to offer an abstract of Mr. Blair's work to the notice of our readers; following the order adopted in his treatise, and remarking occasionally, as we proceed, upon the features which slavery exhibits amongst us.

1. *Of the number of Slaves of the Romans.*

We have before alluded to the antiquity of slavery.—There has not existed a great nation of ancient times, of which we have any account, that has been wholly without a servile class. Of all the different systems of slavery, that of the Romans was the most extended in its operation and the most methodized in its details. Romulus made his city an asylum for runaway slaves, and therefore, from the very foundation of Rome, the institution may be traced. The best sources of information inform us, that the numbers of this unfortunate class of beings were exceedingly large. They constituted nearly the sole domestics employed in the city, and the chief part of the operatives; and although not, at first, the only agricultural labourers, they became gradually more and more used, till in the time of the Gracchi there were hardly any free husbandmen in Italy; and this continued until a late era of the empire. The free labourers were liable to be sent off to the army in time of war, and thus their labours to be interrupted; this was one reason for the employment of slaves. Others were found in the inducements held out by a city life for most of the free inhabitants to resort to Rome. In the early ages of the republic, the exercise of the elective franchise and the excitements of the canvass attracted all who were entitled to share in them; to these, in the prosperous periods of the empire, a passion for theatrical amusements succeeded; and finally, the largesses of the emperors, to buy the tranquillity of the mob, made the great city the centre of attraction, and absorbed the wishes of the masters of the world. To all this was added the complete facility of supply which war and commerce offered. We shall, under the next head, advert to the nature and extent of this resource.

It is by no means easy to arrive at the true numbers of the citizens of Rome, as set forth in the various *censuses* which are handed down to us. Some writers have attributed the difficulty to the supposition of the censors being more or less strict, at different periods, in the discharge of their duties. Our author thinks, with reason, that the most satisfactory explanation is furnished by the fact of the census being made up for different purposes, at different times. Some were held in order to ascertain the number of males capable of bearing arms; others the amount of taxable property and its holders; and others again

for objects equally distinct. The like difficulty meets us in our endeavours to ascertain the number of the slaves. It is a matter of much regret, that the ancients themselves, who had it so completely in their power, have not left us certain sources of information. The births, deaths, marriages and divorces of the freemen were registered separately, but not those of the slaves; though frequent returns of the latter, as of other property, were given in to the censors by persons liable to taxation.

It would appear, from an accurate examination, that in the space of time between the expulsion of the kings and the fall of Coriath (B. C. 146), there was one slave to every free Roman. This is a smaller proportion than is to be found in any of the Grecian states. In Athens, the proportion was between three and four slaves to a free person,* and in Sparta, there were three and one-third slaves to one citizen.† The comparative number of slaves, however, at Rome, afterwards increased; induced principally by the great increase of wealth which followed their conquests in Greece, Asia and Egypt. We may remark, in passing, that domestic slaves were much more numerous at Rome than at Athens.

The number of citizens returned to Augustus at the 72d lustrum (A. U. C. 745) was 4,163,000, and about the same amount was given in twenty-one years after. In the reign of Claudius, at the 74th lustrum (A. U. C. 800), A. D. 48, the citizens amounted to 6,944,000. If we allowed but two slaves for every free person (a proportion considerably below that in Athens and Sparta, where they had but an inconsiderable intermediate class), the number of slaves would be about 14,000,000, and then we should not be taking into account those who were the property of the various orders of freedmen, or even of the slaves themselves. This number was in many instances very large. Some of this class are said to have possessed even 20,000 of their fellow-creatures. Our author concludes, that to be accurate, we should, in the time of the emperor Claudius, assign three slaves to every free person; and this calculation would make the entire population of Italy, in that era, 27,776,000; viz: free, 6,944,000, and slaves, 20,832,000. It is to be remembered, that this estimate is formed of Italy in the season of her highest prosperity and wealth; and when we consider that in her present depressed condition, her population is supposed to be between sixteen and seventeen millions, Mr. Blair's calculation will not seem exaggerated. This average will embrace the space of time between the conquest of Greece

* Free citizens, 120,000; slaves, 400,000.

† Citizens, 150,000; slaves, 500,000. The Spartans had more slaves than any other Grecian state.

(B. C. 146) and the reign of Alexander Severus (A. D. 222—235). It is difficult to fix the successive gradations; but an estimate, much lower, must be formed, in judging of the ages immediately preceding the fall of the western empire. In the reign of Justinian, freedom is said to have been the general rule, and slavery the exception. The latter however is to be traced in Italy down to the 13th century.

We may remark here, that Gibbon (*Hist. Rom. Emp.* ch. 43) estimates the number of souls in the whole Roman world in the age of Claudius, at 120,000,000, of whom one half were slaves. Many of the Roman slaves were possessed by the state, and by different corporate bodies. The department of the police, which guarded against fire, employed six hundred of them in that useful duty.

We must not omit a notice of the gladiators, who were principally slaves, and who composed an important item in their numbers. These were as often the property of individuals as of the public. The sanguinary taste of the Romans for gladiatorial exhibitions is well known, their satisfaction being generally proportionate to the slaughter of the combatants. Augustus felt himself compelled to order the magistrates not to give shows of gladiators more than twice a year, or of more than than sixty pairs at a time. Julius Cæsar exhibited at once three hundred and twenty pairs. Trajan kept up the spectacle for one hundred and twenty-three days, during which ten thousand of the poor wretches fought. The same taste was manifested in the provinces. Josephus (*Hist.* xix.) says, that king Agrippa exhibited in Judea seven hundred pairs at the same time.

With the decline of the empire, slavery itself declined. May heaven avert a like example in our own country! The hopes of those philanthropists who have indulged the fond anticipations of beholding the whole of our happy soil one day free from this "curse," will be, in such a result, most sadly disappointed. Slavery, however, is fortunately here of comparatively limited extent. The number of slaves in the United States, as compared with the whole free population, is less than one to five. The danger, too, will be lessened, if means can be found of transporting the slaves from the country as they are emancipated. The injury which, it will be seen hereafter, the Roman empire suffered from the existence of slaves in such numbers in the midst of her, would thus be averted. Causes, too, the result of an enlarged sense of justice and of mercy, the increase of civilization and knowledge, and a sense of self preservation, will effectuate the manumission of this unfortunate class of beings in our land. While in Rome, other and less honourable causes worked the decrease of their number. Remote and unsuccessful wars no longer replenished the horrible

waste of the *sports* of the amphitheatre; the precarious state of national affairs, which rendered trade so insecure, cut off another fruitful source of supply; and the demand, at the same time, was diminished, as the middle ranks of Romans became of less ability to support a numerous family of domestics; the want of intercourse with Africa and other places inducing occasional and destructive famines.

We will proceed now to the second head—

2. *The Sources of Slavery among the Romans.*

We may premise, that slavery in Rome was a creature merely of the civil law, and not pretended to have any foundation in the law of nature. (3 Inst. I. Tit. de jure personarum.) In Greece a contrary opinion either prevailed, or met with strong support. In the former country the modes of acquiring property in slaves were of four kinds—by war, commerce, the operation of law in certain cases, and by birth.

The harsh treatment of prisoners throughout antiquity, is familiar to our readers. The general rule of the Romans seems to have been to grant life and liberty to their enemies who surrendered without a contest, but to carry away, as prisoners, those who made resistance. These first graced their conqueror's triumph, and were then either condemned to fight as gladiators or with wild beasts, or were sold as slaves—the public generally retaining a portion for public use. This last was also a practice of the Greeks. The terms used by the Romans to designate the word "slaves," are sufficiently expressive of their derivation.* Our readers may form an idea of the great numbers of their prisoners of war, and of the money raised by their sale, from the following abstract, which our author has furnished us from some of the ancient historians.

"After the fall of the Samnites at Aquilonia, 2,553,000 (or, 2,033,000) pieces of brass were realized by the sale of prisoners, who amounted to about 36,000. Lucretius brought from the Volscian war 1250 captives; and, by the capture of one inconsiderable town, no less than 4000 slaves were obtained. The number of the people of Epirus taken and sold for behoof of the army, under Paulus Emilius, was 150,000. On the Romans' descent upon Africa, in the first Punic war, they took 20,000 prisoners. Gelon, prætor of Syracuse, having routed a Carthaginian army, took so many captives, that he gave 500 of them to each of several citizens of Agrigentum. On the great victory of Marius and Catulus over the Cimbri, 60,000 were captured. When Pindenissus was taken by Cicero, the inhabitants were sold for more than 100,000*l*. Augustus, having overcome the Salassi, sold as slaves 36,000, of whom 8,000 were capable of bearing arms. Julius Cæsar is said by Plutarch and Appian to have taken, in his Gallic wars alone, no fewer than 1,000,000 of prisoners; a statement which is, no doubt, much exaggerated, but which shows that the number

* *Municipia* from "*manu capiuntur*," and *servi* from the verb "*servare*."

was considered to be great; perhaps we may adopt the estimate of Velleius Paterculus, who says, merely, that they exceeded 400,000."—Pp. 19, 20.

The unfortunate beings who, from physical defects or other causes, were regarded as valueless by their captors, were generally butchered. So much for *war*, as one source of supply. Let us now turn our attention, for an instant, to the next in order, *commerce*.

With many branches of commerce the Roman government interfered for the purpose of fostering and encouraging them—but in no instance with the foreign slave-trade. This fact is not attributable to any indifference to the importance and value of slaves to their frame of society; but our author, we think, justly ascribes it to the existence of a constant and steady demand, and no less constant and steady sources of supply. Her people were almost always engaged in war, or exploring the shores of unknown seas and rivers, to minister to the brutal taste of their fellow-citizens, continually hankering after some new specimen of barbaric strength or beauty. We have adverted above to the great waste of life in the case of slaves, which was not replenished by any considerable home production; the laws on the subject of marriage, as we shall see hereafter, not being such as to promote this result. They were, therefore, necessarily brought from abroad; and this same reason, although the importations were very numerous, afforded, universally, to slave-dealers, considerable, and, in many instances, enormous profits. Whether taken openly or secretly, their acquisition never cost much. A slight notice of the Roman commerce in slaves may not be inappropriate.

The Romans were not a great maritime nation before the Punic wars. Soon after Tarquin's expulsion they had indeed some trade with Carthage. This city exported largely of slaves to both Italy and Greece; and, in her turn, got many from Corsica, which was formerly very populous. The majority of the slaves, however, which the Carthaginians obtained, were procured from the interior of Africa. We cannot restrain, in mentioning this fact, the train of reflections which it naturally forces on the mind. Poor Africa! from the earliest times her children have been doomed to quaff this "bitter draught." Whenever she has come in contact with the inhabitants of other sections of the earth, they have invariably extended, not the hand of kindness, but the arm of oppression towards her. Her sons and her daughters were the labourers and the handmaidens of the old Romans, and, at the lapse of centuries of oppression, they were found still poured forth, in thousands, to serve their hard taskmasters in a new world. Africa, in fact, has been the great storehouse of slavery—the officina servorum—whence her children have been

spread over the face of the earth. We cannot but fancy that some primeval curse, unknown to us, has been exercising its mysterious sway over that unhappy land; and that possibly, in the order of Providence, at some future day, a terrible retribution may go forth for her mighty wrongs.

The internal African slave trade appears to have been conducted in those early times pretty much as it has been in our own day. The Garamantes, a people in the interior of the continent, (whose country lay between 26° and 28° north latitude, and 15° and 18° east longitude,) were famous for their activity in the capture and sale of their miserable fellow men; the Troglodyte Ethiopians were the chief victims of these, their more warlike neighbours.

In the East, at an early period, the principal emporia for slaves were situated on the Black Sea; some, in what is now Crim Tartary. In fact, Scythia was so fertile a magazine for slaves, that Cicero (*Pro Leg. Manil.* 12) tells us, that "Scythian" was almost synonymous with "slave."

The island of Delos was, however, the great mart for this species of traffic in those days. After the fall of Corinth, it rose rapidly as a commercial entrepot; and so brisk was the traffic, that as many as ten thousand slaves have been imported and re-exported in a single day. The pirates of Cilicia, (whom, it is known, Pompey finally destroyed,) resorted thither with their slaves. Notwithstanding their destruction, the eastern part of the Mediterranean never ceased to be infested with piratical adventurers, who sold their captives into slavery.

After the Mithridatic war, the trade, in those parts, was chiefly confined to the cities upon the Euxine.

Phrygia, Syria, Media, Mœsia and Bithynia were all tributary, in this respect, to the mistress of the world. The slaves from Egypt and Ethiopia were shipped from Alexandria. Thrace, Illyria, and Spain furnished their proportion. It is instructive to dwell for a moment upon the reverses of fortune which nations sustain; it is a wholesome lesson for national pride. The haughty isle of England supplied slaves for Rome, long even after the age of St. Gregory. It was the sight of some of these fine-looking fellows, exposed to sale in the market of Rome, which suggested to that potentate the conversion of our British brethren. We have seen that the birth-place of Napoleon was also a slave market.

The profits of slave dealers may be imagined from the statement of the low price at which prisoners were sold in the different camps after their capture. When war was pushed into distant places, it was impossible for the officers or troops to bring them to the capital. The dealers, therefore, resorted to

the camps. It is stated that, in the camp of Lucullus, in Pontus, a man might be purchased for three shillings, whilst his minimum price at Rome was about £15.

In most countries even parents sold their children into slavery. Greece is said to have been an honourable and solitary exception.

In early times, in Rome, it is known parents had the power of putting their children to death; and hence, no doubt, the milder exercise of authority, viz: that of sale, was considered lawful. A Roman father could sell his children three different times before his authority in this respect was at an end.

Man-stealing, (*plagium*), was a very prevalent crime of antiquity. The poet, Terence, was kidnapped from Carthage. In the East it was very common; St. Paul, (Epistle to Timothy, i. 10,) by his denunciation, proves it to have been frequent.

Sometimes even freemen were illegally carried off into bondage. Great facilities for this enormity were offered by the circumstance of private individuals being permitted, in troublous times, to keep private jails, which served the purpose both of detection and concealment. There was a writ provided by the Roman law for the protection of freemen, which is worthy of being noticed, as it bears a strong similarity to the famous English writ of habeas corpus. It was called "interdictum," and compelled the party detaining a person in custody to bring him before the proper judge.

Originally, a citizen of Rome could not sell himself irrevocably as a slave. In the reign, however, of Hadrian, it was allowed to persons, who had attained twenty years of age, to do so, upon receiving a compensation. In times of national distress, famine for instance, it was not uncommon for poor persons to sell themselves without any deceit. Some curious forms of deeds of this description are contained in the notes to Mr. Blair's work.

A covenant, analogous in its effects to a deed of self-sale, was made when a person agreed to go into the *arena*, and bound himself to combat whenever ordered by his hirer, who could use the lash to enforce obedience, as in the case of slaves. He was not, after this, admissible as a witness, or if so, only when under torture. In the later ages of the empire, similar consequences attached to free-born persons who entered the public establishments for manufactures of various sorts; and also to free persons who went upon the stage; who, as well as their children, were not permitted to abandon the scenic profession, except in certain specified cases. In the time of Theodosius, players supposed to be near death were allowed to receive the sacrament, but if they recovered, were not permitted to return to the stage. Their state of health was, therefore, particularly

examined before they were admitted to partake of that ordinance.

The operation of law sometimes reduced free-born Romans to slavery. Condemnation to death, to the arena, or to labour for life in the mines or public works, produced this result. Such were denominated "slaves of punishment" (*servi pœnæ*), and belonged to the *fisc*, or the emperor's private purse. Justinian abolished the condition of penal slaves. At one time, inability to pay the value of stolen property, or of damage done to another's estate, operated as a deprivation of liberty. During the early ages of Christianity, reduction to slavery in a very horrid form, our author says, was employed as a punishment for embracing the faith. The treatment of female Christians was peculiarly enormous.

How far the power of creditors over the persons of their debtors extended, has been, it is known, a subject of much dispute with the learned. The weight of authority* is in favour of the opinion, that if a debtor could not meet the just demands of his creditors, the judges might put him into their hands, with authority to them either to cut him into pieces, or to sell him into servitude across the Tiber. The right of detaining him, then, as a slave in Rome, was implied in this greater authority. Cicero (*Epist. vii, 30*) says so expressly. Our author gives some curious details of the effects resulting from intrigues between free-born women and slaves, for which we would refer the reader to the book itself.—(P. 42, &c.)

The exposure of children was never adequately punished by the Roman laws. It was, by no means, of singular occurrence. It even came to be established as a rule, that such children should be the slaves of those who took and brought them up. It was not until Justinian's time, that it was finally decreed, that exposed children, of whatever class, should be free.

Vagrant slaves were looked upon in the light of stray or vacant goods, and held to belong to the emperor; he frequently made gifts of them to individuals. This sometimes gave rise to considerable abuses.

When one living as a free person was claimed as a slave, he was not by law to be delivered up to the claimant during process. Appius Claudius therefore violated the spirit of the law when he decided that Virginia was to be surrendered to her claimant, under pretence that none but her father had a right to demand her custody, *pendente lite*.

* We may cite Niebuhr, Levesque, and our author among the moderns, and of the ancients themselves, Aulus Gellius, Quintilian and Tertull. *Apol. c. 4*. We refer in the above passage to the Laws of the Twelve Tables.

Manumitted slaves, or freedmen, (of whom we shall say a word hereafter,) might be again reduced to slavery, if, during their *libertinism*, they acted with ingratitude towards their old masters. It would seem, then, that the tenure of their freedom was very loose. This idea and practice were borrowed from the Athenians.

We may remark, that after the establishment of Christianity, when slaves, who, with their master's leave, had become priests or monks, abandoned their profession, they reverted to their old bonds.

In all antiquity, slavery by birth depended upon the condition of the mother. As she was, free or bond, so were her children. We should not omit, however, to notice a humane distinction, which is not found in the laws of any people but the Romans. The whole period of gestation was taken into view in determining the question of slave or freeman, and if, at any one instant during that space of time, the mother had been free, the law, by a merciful fiction, held the birth to have taken place then, and gave liberty to the offspring.

It seems hardly necessary to say, that since the abolition of the horrible traffic in human beings, *birth* has been the only source of slavery in the United States. This may seem to the eye of reason the least plausible ground of all for its perpetuity; and most certainly the proposition will not bear an argument. And yet, from the earliest antiquity, the legality of this source has been assumed. The perpetuity of slavery followed, of consequence, its inheritable quality. An intelligent writer* has noticed the distinction which the slaves of the Hebrews enjoyed over those of Greece or Rome, and which even the slaves of modern times are not blessed with. Of the unhappy Israelite bondman, "a day of jubilee" brightened the prospects, when his eye roamed over his future destiny. And the anticipation may have cheered many a dreary hour of solitary slavery and toil. The word of the Lord had said, and the slave had heard it, "Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land, *and unto all the inhabitants thereof.*" (Leviticus, xxv. 10.)

We must pass, however, to the next head.

3. *Descriptions of Slaves, and conditions of Slaves, in relation to Citizens.*

Previously to the arrival of the Lombards in Italy, there were but three distinct appellations for different grades of servitude. After that event we find numerous terms, which it would be no easy matter accurately to define. The three denominations

* Stroud on Slavery.

were, 1, Slaves, technically so called (*servi*, *mancipia* or *servitia*); 2, *Adscriptitii*, or *adscripti glebæ*, bondmen fixed to the soil; and, 3, Husbandmen (*coloni*) or tenants (*inquilini*), called sometimes *originales*, or *originarii*, originals, when born in that class.

We have not in the United States any grade answering to the description of either numbers 2 or 3. All the slaves here bear a strong analogy to those under the English tenures, who were denominated "*villeins in gross*," or, at large, that is, annexed to the person of the lord, and transferable by deed from one owner to another. The second class are similar to the "*villeins regardant*," under the same tenures, who were annexed to the manor or land. The condition of those villeins in England would, indeed, seem to have been no better than the slaves in Rome. All the slaves here are strictly *servi*, and not the better, either, for not being attached to the soil. It will be perceived at once, from the sketch we have given of the various sources whence the Romans derived their slaves, that no one *complexion* stamped its owner with the ineffaceable mark of slavery. Men and women, of all the different hues under heaven, composed the dreary list of Roman slaves; and they had, at least, the one satisfaction of knowing, that no particular origin, and no particular climate, marked them out for proscription. But here slavery has placed her finger upon the children of one race, whose dark complexion—"the shadowed livery of the burnished sun,"—has sunk them irretrievably below their fellow-beings. Whether viewing them as slaves or not, the whites are but too apt to apply to them the designation which an old historian* attached to the whole servile class, "*secundum genus hominum*," an inferior race of mortals.

We shall offer an extract from this part of Mr. Blair's work, as it contains, in a more condensed form than we could ourselves present it, an abstract of some of the relations of slaves to citizens. We cite from page 51.

"The original condition of slaves, in relation to freemen, was as low as can be conceived. They were not considered members of the community, in which they had no station nor place. They possessed no rights, and were not deemed persons in law; so that they could neither sue nor be sued, in any court of civil judicature, and they could not invoke the protection of the tribunes. So far were those notions carried, that, when an alleged slave claimed his freedom, on the ground of unjust detention in servitude, he was under the necessity of having a free protector to sue for him, till Justinian dispensed with that formality.

"Slaves could not enter into matrimony, even with parties of their own rank, their union with whom was of an imperfect nature, violation of which was not accounted adultery; the Christian church itself did not maintain openly the validity of slave nuptials, till after the period embraced by this

* Florus, iii. 20.

treatise. Attempts of free persons to form marriages with slaves were severely punished. Slaves had not the usual paternal power over their children, and no ties of blood among slaves were recognised, except in respect to incest and parricide, which were regarded with horror by the law of nature; yet if slaves became free, their former relationships received effect; but their *contubernium* did not tacitly obtain the force of a regular marriage. Slaves were incapable of holding property, or directly exercising any power over it independently of their lord, although they might, with his sanction, be proprietors of land. Whatever they acquired belonged to their master. The latter frequently allowed them to enjoy property of their own (*peculium*), consisting sometimes of other slaves; but they possessed it by tolerance only; and any legal proceedings connected with it were necessarily conducted in the name of the master, who alone was regarded as the true proprietor, whether plaintiff or defendant. Masters were fully bound by the acts of their slaves, when they had ordered or permitted them to manage any business for them; and were always liable for their engagements, to the extent of the benefit derived thence, or to the amount of the slave's peculiar funds.

"No slave could hold a public office; and many lawyers have thought, that if a person, truly a slave, should attain such a place, all his acts would be null."

"The more ancient armies of Rome were composed entirely of free-born citizens; even those who had long been freedmen were not taken into their ranks. Under the alarm of great public danger, and during civil wars, slaves were occasionally taken, but were not enlisted before being emancipated. Augustus first regularly enrolled freedmen among the troops; and later emperors, in spite of a general law against slaves coming forward as recruits, compelled proprietors to contribute a certain proportion of their slaves to make up the levies, the slaves acquiring freedom, and sometimes a bounty, by their enrolment; but emancipated recruits appear to have been generally made foot-soldiers, and not admitted into the superior service of the cavalry. Slaves are said by Pliny to have been prohibited from learning certain of the liberal arts, such as painting and engraving, or embossing; but this law was manifestly disregarded.

"The use of particular articles of dress, assigned to free-born Romans, was strictly forbidden to slaves. And those magnificent establishments of public baths, which afforded daily luxury to the meanest plebeians, were closed against the servile population. Slaves were also debarred from the use of carriages, horses or litters, within the walls of the city. One of Plautus' prologues leaves no doubt that slaves were admitted into the remote parts of the theatre, and even without paying; but this latter privilege, we may safely conjecture, was limited to those in attendance on their masters, who formed part of the audience."

Injuries to slaves were considered as of but very little importance when compared with those of a similar kind suffered by freemen.* Until the reign of Severus, the injury, too, though felt really by the slave, was considered, in law, as done only to the master; he received the compensation therefor. In later times, the murder of a slave was declared to be as great a crime as the murder of a freeman. When, in process of time, the exercise of domestic authority by parents and masters came

* By a law of the Twelve Tables, for beating out the tooth of a freeman, the fine was 7*s.* 1*d.*; for a similar hurt to a slave, 3*s.* 6½*d.* We give this merely as an example.

to be restrained, Augustus, among many other liberal enactments, directed the court of the prefect of the city to entertain the mutual complaints of masters and slaves; and there the latter were suffered to appear and act on their own behalf.

Slaves enjoyed no immunity from punishment for crimes and misdemeanors. In the case of pecuniary penalties the master was interested, as he was responsible to the extent of the slave's value. No compensation was made to the former for either the total or partial loss of the slave by execution or imprisonment.

In administering their penal laws, the Romans shut their eyes upon reason and upon justice. They made, not the grade of the offence, but the rank of the offender, the measure of punishment. "The lower the culprit," says Blair, "the more severe was the pain." And even, in some cases, guilt was the presumption of law fastened upon slaves, which they had it not in their power to rebut or disprove. They were held unworthy to die by the Tarpeian rock, which witnessed only the deaths of freemen. And, in the later ages of Rome, the modes of putting slaves to death were made exceedingly ignominious and painful. It is known that crucifixion was a manner of destroying life appropriated to the punishment of slaves and the viler malefactors, and for that reason selected by the Jews, as an evidence of their rancorous contempt towards the Saviour. Late in the empire, even burning alive was resorted to.

The testimony of slaves was received to a certain extent; but they were seldom examined without being subjected to the torture. All that was requisite to secure their testimony was, that the party wishing it should give security to compensate the master, in case the slave suffered injury or died under the torture. A vast variety of engines of torment were used by the Romans. We shall not stain our pages by a description of them, or of their peculiar mode of operation. Any one, curious upon the subject, may indulge his taste to the full by consulting the authorities which Mr. Blair has collected in his notes to pages 63 and 64. The naked fact, that innocent individuals should be doomed to torment, to gratify the whim or even the interests of others, is enough to sicken the soul.

In religious matters the Romans were remarkably tolerant; indeed, foreign divinities and rites were very fashionable, and, at one time, those of Egypt, childish and disgusting as they were, went near to supplant their original objects of adoration. They therefore naturally suffered their slaves to follow any religion they chose. Mr. Blair says—

"There is good reason to believe that it was customary to permit slaves to employ a small portion of each day in worship; and that, when convenient, the master went through the proper devotional exercises for all his

household. It is certain that, in ages of simplicity at least, rustic masters and their slaves united in offering up sacrifices to the gods who crowned their toils with plenty; and it was not deemed improper for a *villicus*, although a slave, to perform sacrifice by himself. Plautus, too, gives us directly to understand that slaves were permitted to make offerings to Venus. As it was common for persons dying without kin to leave liberty to some of their slaves, who might keep up the sacred rites of their family, we may conclude that bondsmen were permitted to aid their master in the worship of his household gods, by which they might best learn what was deemed acceptable to those beings."

The rites of burial were not denied to them; and monuments were often erected to them by the liberality and kindness of their masters or friends, though the slaves of indigent owners were often thrown, without ceremony, into the common burying-places.

Christianity did not neglect their spiritual welfare. The church allowed their participation in all the ordinances of religion. St. Paul mentions their baptism (1 Cor. xii. 13); and they were not withheld from aspiring even to the episcopate; this dignity conferred freedom upon them. Though the canon law recognised the indissolubility of their marriages, yet it was not promulged until a late period, from fear of injury to slave-owners. Under the Christian emperors they were fully protected in the exercise of worship; and, to some degree, in the observance of religious festivals. The license of the *Saturnalia* was transferred to Christmas; and the slaves were generally exempted from labour during the religious holidays. These, including Sundays, amounted to sixty-five in the year.

The differences between the condition of the *adscriptitii* and the *coloni*, and that of the *servi*, which we have been considering, are too minute, and would occupy more space than we can afford to devote to them; we must, therefore, refer our readers for this information to the book itself.

Slaves were made the subjects of taxation, both as property and as individuals. A tax was laid upon their manumission and sale. Slave-dealers paid a duty; and an impost of one-eighth, *ad-valorem*, appears to have been levied upon slaves imported into Italy for sale.

Less need be said upon the next head, as many of the remarks heretofore made will be applicable to it. It is styled,

4. Condition of Slaves in relation to their Masters.

We shall present a summary of this relationship. The slave had no protection against the avarice, rage or lust of the master: and, for a long time, the latter possessed the power of life and death.* There was no obligation upon him to furnish

* For instances of domestic tyranny, see page 107 of Blair.

proper food or clothing, or to take care of them in sickness. Slaves could have no property, but by sufferance of their master; nor be parties to any contract. They could be transferred at the option of their master; and philosophers even exercised their ingenuity upon the question whether a slave could confer any benefit upon his master. The Roman government claimed and exercised the right of interference with slave property to a much greater extent than any modern European states have gone, until the late statute of the British Parliament—one of the brightest spots in the career of the whig ministry.

The despotic authority of masters was much mitigated during the empire, particularly under Christian rulers; the successive restraints upon the owner's power, we cannot, however, at present notice.

Of one temporary protection, slaves were, at all times, permitted to avail themselves—that of sanctuaries. In heathen times, the temples and altars of the gods, and the palace and images of the emperor, afforded them safety. In the city of Rome, the temples of Julius Cæsar and Diana Aventina were the chief places of resort. After the introduction of Christianity, the Christian churches and shrines received the same privileges. It was considered sacrilegious for the master to drag his slave from these holy places; and Theodosius the Great allowed the latter, while there, to invoke the aid of the judge, and to proceed unmolested to the tribunal where the merits of his case were to be investigated. If the slave was in a Christian church, it was the duty of the ecclesiastics to intercede for him with his master; and if he proved inexorable, they could permit the slave to remain until he chose to depart or his master granted him forgiveness.

5. Of the Treatment of Slaves.

This was not much regulated by legislative enactment, but was left generally to custom. We shall select, from this head, those particulars merely in which our readers would feel some interest. Food we shall pass over. Until the reign of Alexander Severus, the slaves were not directed to wear any particular dress; they were simply prohibited from using the gown (toga), ball (bulla), or the gold ring, which were the badges of citizenship. Female slaves were forbidden to assume the stole (stola), which was appropriated to free matrons. White was uniformly the dress of slaves upon the stage; and in later times, a belt or girdle was the mark of bondsmen, for whom it served as a means of punishment. Some have supposed that they were forbidden to wear shoes, but our author proves this to be an erroneous idea, and cites the cases of the elder Cato and the emperor Nero, who were both in the habit

of dispensing with the usual covering of the feet, which would not have been done by them, had it been a common sign of slavery. The hair of slaves was suffered to grow very long, and was cut off at their emancipation. Those belonging to families of the higher orders, were most sumptuously apparelled; and young and handsome slaves were most delicately guarded from injury.

Considerable attention was paid by some masters to the general education or to the improvement of particular accomplishments of their slaves. There was a slave school (which would not be without its use in our country) for dexterous carving at table. Slaves were, of course, rendered more valuable in proportion to the cultivation of their talents. We shall give some instances of masters who are known to have been particularly anxious about the instruction of their slaves. Atticus, Crassus, Virgil and Mæcenas were honourably distinguished in this respect. In a political point of view, the Romans do not appear to have felt any dread of instruction being imparted to them; it is less to their credit to add, that they were utterly deficient in attention to their religious or moral cultivation.

A redeeming trait in the general features of Roman society, is to be found in the attention that was paid to the amusements of their slaves. Without it, their condition would have been truly intolerable. Our author's account of the famous *Saturnalia* is very brief, and we shall therefore extract it.

"Slaves were forbidden to participate in few of the public diversions, while their solace and amusement were particularly studied in celebrating certain festivals, partly of a national and partly of a domestic character. On all such occasions, various indulgences were granted to the slave population, of the same kind with those accorded at the *Saturnalia*, but in a less degree. The feast in honour of Saturn was meant to exhibit a temporary revival of the golden age, and the primitive equality of mankind; but it was carried further in respect to slaves; they were not merely allowed to enjoy a respite from labour and restraint, but were treated like masters, their lords acting, in some things, as their servants. They had perfect license to say what they pleased, without risk of chastisement; they feasted at their master's table, while he waited upon them; they were indulged in gambols of all sorts, denied them at other seasons; and there was a suspension, not merely of domestic control, but of public subordination. Slaves wore the robe of freemen, elected mock magistrates, it is supposed, and struck medals in commemoration of their festivities."—P. 115.

The *Saturnalia*, under the emperors, lasted seven days, beginning with the 19th day of December, according to our calendar.

Similar liberties were allowed at the feast of the *Matronalia*, in March, when their mistresses waited upon them; and upon occasion of other festivities.

Slaves never bore three names like freemen, but most usually had only one.

We have adverted before to the fact, that the treatment of slaves was more severe during the republic than under the emperors. Is there any thing in a free government to produce this result? We wish that the facts bore us out in saying no. Smith, in his *Wealth of Nations* (iv. 7), remarks, "That the condition of a slave is better under an arbitrary than under a free government, is, I believe, supported by the history of all ages and nations." Gibbon (*Hist. Rom. Emp.* ch. 44) bears testimony to the beneficial influence of the Christian religion upon the situation of slaves under the empire. Bishop Porteous (Sermon 17th), in the following passage, pays this compliment to our faith. Speaking of the Divine Author of it, he says, "He preached a doctrine which not only released from spiritual bondage those that had been enthralled and led captive by their passions, but so softened and subdued the most ferocious minds, and diffused throughout the earth such a spirit of mildness, gentleness, mercy and humanity, that the heavy chains of personal slavery were gradually broken in most parts of the Christian world: and they that had been for so many ages *bruised* by the cruel and oppressive hand of Pagan masters, were at length set free."

6. *Occupations of Slaves.*

The list of servile occupations would furnish matter of itself for abundant reflection and observation. It opens, at once, a wide and extended survey into the domestic manners of that extraordinary people—their modes of society—their habits, refinements, wants and occupations. Much, that strikes us as supremely ridiculous and laughable, can be derived from these notices; but while we may with perfect propriety enjoy such a treat, we should carefully avoid the fault into which travellers, particularly British tourists, are so apt to fall, of considering their own customs and peculiarities as necessarily perfect, and laying down as positive national imperfections, casual differences in what, after all, is a mere matter of conventional arrangement.

Slaves were divided into public and private. The former were the guardians of the public buildings, the attendants of the priests and magistrates, the lictors, the public executioners, the watermen, and generally all those under the direction of the public bodies. The latter were Rustic or Urban, those in the country or the city. On these we shall offer a few remarks.

The list furnished by Mr. Blair at p. 131, is well worthy of being perused. The division of labour which it unfolds is

remarkable; and no less remarkable is it, to observe the extreme lengths to which luxury was carried by the higher and wealthier classes. We will extract for our reader's amusement the array of household slaves, personal attendants, and slaves of luxury, in part, which are comprised in the work. Our house-keepers, our belles, and our beaux may take a lesson from it.

Household Slaves.

Cook.	Chief Cook.	Pottage Maker.
Pickler.	Pastry Cook.	Confectioner.
Dairyman.	Fruit Dresser.	Cake Baker.
Baker.	Fire Boy.	Pantry Keeper.
Store Keeper.	Butler.	Caterer.
Table Steward.	Orderer of Bill of Fare.	Banqueting-room Slaves.
Couch Spreader.	Table Wiper.	Ornamental Confectioner.
Inviter.	Announcer.	Server.
Taster.	Carver.	Distributor.
Waiter.	Cupbearer.	Watchman.
Porter.	Curtain Keeper.	Hall Keeper.
House Cleaner.	Sweeper.	Drudge.
Furniture Keeper.	Silver Plate Keeper.	Gold Plate Keeper, &c.

Personal Attendants.

Valet-de-chambre.	Silence Keeper.	Sleep Watcher.
Bath Keeper.	Bath Heater.	Ointment Maker.
Anointer	Hair Extractor.	Barber.
Hair Dresser, Male	Ear-ring Woman.	Hair Curler.
and Female	Powderer.	Toilet Slave.
Dresser.	Wardrobe Keeper.	Female Dress Folder.
Dress Inspector.	Chest Keeper.	Hour Caller.
Remembrancer.	Prompter.	Namer.
Follower.	Foot Boy.	Runner (post boys).
Announcer.	Sword Bearer.	Lamp Bearer.
Torch Bearer.	Litter Bearer.	Chair Bearer.
Sedan Bearer.	Letter Bearer.	Message Bearer.
Fan Bearer.	Fly Flapper.	Umbrella Bearer.
Sandal Bearer.	Picker-up, &c.	

Attendants of Youth.

Nurse.	Male Nurse.	Carrier.
Rocker.	Nursery Tutor.	Teacher.
Pedagogue.	Satchel Carrier, &c.	

Slaves of Luxury.

Librarian.	Dancer.	Wrestler, &c.
Reciter of Homer's	Reader.	Reciter.
Works.	Story Teller.	Secretary.
Fool. Idiot.	Dwarf.	Hermaphrodite.
(qu? the difference.)	Glutton	Eunuch.
Buffoon	Masker.	Darling.
Physician.	Surgeon.	Oculist.
Rubber with Ointment.	Shampooer.	Magician.
Diviner.	Grammarian.	Antiquary.
Penman.	Player.	Mime.
Singer.	Harper.	Piper.

The list might be extended much further; sufficient, however, has been given for our purpose.

Upon one of the occupations above noted, we will offer a remark. The name "Inviter" is found in the classification. His duty was to invite guests to his master's table. We may presume, from the circumstances of some transactions on record, that the roll of guests, on great occasions, was left somewhat to the slave's discretion. He made the best use of the privilege, and generally *made sale* of the invitations. These venders of their master's hospitality often made large sums of money. It is reported by Suetonius that, on one occasion, these slaves (*vocatores*) of the emperor Caligula, pocketed the enormous amount of 1,614*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.* for invitations to a single supper at his table. Their *calling* was of some profit to them.

A word or two upon

7. *The Sale, Value, and Expense of Slaves.*

They were disposed of either at market, by auction, or at private sale. The manner was various. The chief disease against which they were warranted was epilepsy. The principal moral faults, thievishness, running away, and having a disposition to commit suicide! The nation of a slave was considered important. The ordinary phrase used in sales, with reference to the slave, was "alive and seeing, with his food and clothes." The prices varied from a very low to a most extravagant amount—even thousands of pounds.

We have not space to dwell upon *The Termination of Slavery, Manumission*, or the *Condition of Freedmen*, in their relations to *Citizens* or their *Patrons*. We must hasten to a close. They are matters, moreover, generally familiar. Let us turn to our author's *General Observations*.

As compared with Grecian slaves, the actual condition of the Roman bondsmen was unquestionably worse. But the latter had the anticipation of liberty, which but seldom cheered the prospect of the Grecian slave. At Sparta, it was entirely hopeless.

The general character of Roman slaves was decidedly bad. They were famous for lying and stealing, which are, indeed, the vices of slavery. As to the females, Pope's unjust sarcasm upon the whole sex, may be truly applied to them—they had "no character at all."

We fully agree with Mr. Blair in his views of the bad effects of slavery upon the Roman national character and private habits. The higher classes were licentious, the lower classes idle, and both cruel. The country was much injured by their employment in agriculture. Another evil consequence of their great numbers, was the corruption of the Latin tongue. The dialects of almost the whole globe were to be

heard in Rome; and the effect of this upon the purity of the language may be easily conceived. It was observed by Tacitus to have occurred, before the conquest, even, of the barbarian nations.

The plagues which desolated the Roman world, found abundance of food in the slave population. Contagious diseases were fearfully propagated. The pestilence, in the reign of Justinian, has been thought to have depopulated the earth more than any other single plague. The field for domestic insurrection is sufficiently obvious. A sense of this danger deterred ancient nations from offering liberty to the slaves of their opponents.

Slavery was, in a word, a main cause of the decay of the Roman empire.

For the purpose of enabling our readers to view, at a glance, the comparative condition of the slaves of Rome and of the United States, we shall extract substantially most of the propositions which the author above alluded to (Mr. Stroud) has deduced from an examination of the laws of the slave-holding states. There is, in many respects, a striking analogy with the laws of Rome upon the same subject.

1. The master may determine the kind, and degree, and time of labour, to which the slave shall be subjected.

2. The master may supply the slave with such food and clothing only, both as to quantity and quality, as he may think proper or find convenient.

3. The master may, at his discretion, inflict any punishment upon the person of his slave. (This, of course, excludes power over life or limb. The murder of a slave is punished with death in every state of our Union.)

4. Slaves have no legal rights of property in things real or personal; but whatever they may acquire belongs, in point of law, to their masters.

5. The slave, being a personal chattel, is at all times liable to be sold absolutely, or mortgaged, or leased, at the will of his master, and also at the suit of creditors.

6. A slave cannot be a party before a judicial tribunal, in any species of action, against his master.

7. Slaves cannot redeem themselves.

8. If injured by third persons, their owners may bring suit and recover damages.

9. Slaves can make no contract, nor be parties to a civil suit, nor be witnesses against a white person.

10. The benefits of education are withheld from the slave, and the means of moral and religious instruction are not granted to him.

We wish, in conclusion, to make no invidious remarks; nor to croak in accents of fearful foreboding. At this epoch, it

may be emphatically repeated, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." We would much rather look cheerly forward to the prospect of *Free America*, when evenhanded justice shall deal out equal privileges and rights to all. But the suggestion presses itself upon our notice, and we cannot, if we would, avert our contemplation from it:—What has been gained to the world in this respect, by more than eighteen centuries of Christian light; and by all the civilization and refinement of which the moderns have boasted? Is Africa less the sepulchre of liberty than she was when the Garamantes sold their brethren into bondage? Is the African more free than in the days of the Scipios? Or was the stain of slavery on his forehead of deeper print and dye then than now? If calm reason and incontrovertible facts answer all these questions in the negative, as they must do, it is our's to hang our heads in mortified humility.

ART. IV.—*Substance of Several Courses of Lectures on Music, read in the University of Oxford, and in the Metropolis.* By WILLIAM CROTCH, Mus. D. Professor of Music, Oxford; and Principal of the Royal Academy of Music, London. London. Longman & Co. 1831.

The Music of Nature; or an attempt to prove that what is passionate and pleasing in the art of Singing, Speaking, and Performing upon Musical Instruments, is derived from the sounds of the Animated World. With curious and interesting Illustrations. By WILLIAM GARDINER. London. Longman & Co. 1832.

IN undertaking a review of the volumes of which titles are prefixed to this article, it is not our design to call the attention of our readers to a minute and critical survey of their contents. Such a course would not be likely to lead to a sufficiently useful result to justify the time and space it would require; because Dr. Crotch's work, consisting only of the *substance* of several sets of lectures, embracing a variety of subjects of an historical and critical nature, and compressed within the narrow compass of a small and loosely printed volume; and the second work comprising a large number of short chapters, which in many instances are only remotely connected with music; cannot present those developments on the scientific or philosophic departments of the art which would afford scope for an elaborate article. We must content ourselves, therefore,

with dwelling on a few of the subjects treated in both works, and make use of the remainder of the contents of these as objects of reference rather than of separate and detailed examination.

Dr. Crotch, the author of the first of the volumes before us, has acquired a certain degree of renown in England, not so much from the value and importance of his compositions, as from his having displayed, at an early period of life, a musical capacity or talent of unusual extent, and the more remarkable from the circumstance of his belonging to a nation more distinguished in the useful than in the fine arts. In a paper read before the Royal Society of London, by Dr. Burney—the learned historian of music—it is affirmed that Dr. Crotch played the air of *Let ambition fire thy mind*, when only two years old. Mr. Parke, the author of two amusing volumes of Musical Memoirs, recently published in London, states, that at the age of three years the same gentleman played agreeably on the piano-forte, and “displayed extraordinary genius, surprising all those who witnessed his efforts.”

From these facts, therefore, it would appear that, in respect to precocity of talent, Dr. Crotch may be considered as having rivalled even Mozart himself, who, as is well known, began to compose at the age of four years. Happy would it be for the former, were it possible to continue the parallel between him and the German composer! But unfortunately his precocity of talent has led to results very different from those which were observed in the other. To those who have cultivated music, or are acquainted with the history of the art, it need hardly be told that Mozart's career was short but glorious; that he acquired, long before his death, by an almost incredible number of elegant and masterly compositions for the church, stage, and chamber, a reputation equal to that of any former or contemporary musician; and that, even to this day, he is deservedly regarded as one of the greatest composers the world has produced. If now we turn to Dr. Crotch, we shall find that, though he has composed an Oratorio, *Palestina*, some pieces of an inferior cast for the church, some for the piano forte; that though he has done this, and arranged several pieces for the same instrument, from the writings of Haydn, Mozart, Handel, Weber, Romberg, and written a few works on the philosophy and science of music; he has produced nothing that bears the stamp of a masterly and original mind, or can entitle him to more than an ephemeral and slender reputation, except perhaps among his countrymen.

Of Mr. Gardiner we know nothing further than that he has written the words and compiled the music of the Oratorio of *Judah*,—that he is the compiler of several volumes of sacred

melodies, and of some dramatic pieces; and that he appears, from the volume before us, to be tolerably well versed in the science of harmony, and to have attended to the philosophy and literature of the art.

Having made the reader acquainted, so far at least as we are able, with the professional and other claims of the authors of the works we are about noticing, we shall proceed without further delay to the execution of our task.

Sir William Jones remarks, that music belongs, as a science, to an interesting part of natural philosophy, which, by mathematical deductions from constant phenomena, explains the causes and properties of sound, limits the number of sounds to a certain series, which perpetually recur, and fixes the ratio which they bear to each other, or to one leading term; but considered as an art, it combines the sounds which philosophy distinguishes in such a manner as to gratify our ears or affect our imaginations; or by uniting both objects, to captivate the fancy, while it pleases the senses; and speaking, as it were, the language of nature, to raise corresponding ideas and associations in the mind of the hearer. "It then and then only (he adds) becomes what we may call a fine art, allied very nearly to poetry, painting and rhetoric."

As music may be considered both in its relation to natural philosophy, and in the light of one of the fine arts, it cannot be difficult to understand that an artist, by a happy selection of melody, harmony, modulation, and rhythm, may attain his end, without considering or even knowing any of the theorems in the philosophy of sound. From this circumstance, and from the fact that our object is to call the attention of our readers to some remarks on a few points connected with music viewed in the latter sense, it can hardly be deemed necessary that we should enter upon the consideration of those theorems—that we should treat of the true direction and diversion of sounds propagated by the successive compressions and expansions of air, as the vibrating body advances and recedes; or show "why sounds themselves may excite a tremulous motion in particular bodies, and demonstrate the law by which all the particles of air, when it undulates with great quickness, are continually accelerated and retarded." Besides, those and many other points appertaining to the same branch of inquiry have been illustrated and explained in so many works of easy access, that while admitting the propriety of attending to them, and earnestly recommending the study to every lover of the art, we believe that a disquisition on the subject would be inappropriate in this place, and occupy more space and require more time than we are disposed to devote to it.

Nor shall we dwell long on the doctrine of harmonics, or

those notes produced by the aliquot parts of the sounding body, "whether a harp-string, that of the violincello, a voice, a bell, or an organ-pipe." Interesting as the subject undoubtedly must be, from its connexion with the science of harmony, and the effects of particular combinations, it belongs rather to the philosophical department of music than to the province of the artist, and as such may be studied with more profit in works treating in detail of that subject. Nevertheless, in order that our unmusical readers may have at least a general idea of the nature of harmonics, the discovery of which is due to Rameau, a name celebrated in the annals of French music, we shall present an extract from Dr. Crotch's work, as conveying interesting and useful information on that point.

"There is, in fact, no such thing as an individual musical sound in nature. What we call a single sound is always attended with less powerful sounds; as the octave, produced by the half of the tube or string; the twelfth, produced by one-third; the double octave, produced by one-quarter; the seventeenth, or major third, produced by one-fifth, &c. &c. An inconceivable number of these combine to produce one note, that of the whole tube or string. When the lower notes of an organ, harp, piano-forte, or violincello are sounded singly, an experienced ear will readily distinguish five or six of these harmonics. As the vibrations of a string on the harp or piano-forte subside, the harmonics become more audible. The sound of a voice at a distance has often been mistaken for a chord produced by glee-singers; but, as the voice approached, the harmonics were less audible, and one note only was heard. In bells, the harmonics are heard almost as plainly as the generator.

"These harmonics may be separated and examined on a violincello, by pressing the finger lightly on the string while it is bowed upon. They are also the notes produced by blowing through any simple tube, as the horn and trumpet. The harmonics seem to be imitated on an organ by the stops called cornet, sexquialtera, and mixture, which give full chords for every single note that is played; also by the principal, flute, fifteenth, and twelfth, which furnish one harmonic to each note. When all the stops are out, and only one note sounded, they cause no confusion, though each of these artificial harmonics must be accompanied by its own natural harmonics; but the sounds heard when a full organ is played, if all distinguishable, and equally powerful, would form a most chaotic and unmusical roar. The principal use of the study of harmonics to the young composer is, that they constitute the scales of the trumpet and horn. And though other notes have been added to the horn, by stopping its bole, yet they are inferior as to the quality of their tone to the natural notes. The wild sounds which the wind capriciously elicits from the *Æolian* harp, are the harmonics of its several strings."

Considered in reference to the distinctive features of its composition, music, like painting and the other arts, presents many peculiarities. These peculiarities, which amount sometimes to radical differences, give rise to what have been denominated the different styles of music. It must be a matter of deep regret to all who are sensible of the necessity of precision in language, that by the generality of individuals, and even by many writers on music,

the word style has been, and continues to be, used in a very extended and somewhat indefinite sense.

This circumstance is less remarkable in the other arts; for in them the word is only made use of to denote the mode of execution, any manner which is characteristic or peculiar. In these, therefore, it has reference to the peculiarities marked in the design and execution, and to the assemblage of those qualities or characters which render the work sublime, grand, grotesque, &c., "to the niceties, elegancies, the peculiarities and the beauties of composition, which mark the genius and talent of the artist." In no case does it extend to the use to which those qualities can render that work particularly suited; this circumstance being only influenced by the subjects selected for representation.

In music, however, the word style, while often used in the same sense as in painting and the other arts, is resorted to to express a combination of circumstances, which, though in the main connected with the construction of the work, or the assemblage of the qualities it exhibits, are often of a very opposite nature, and founded on a different basis, but all tending to one particular object. Thus the peculiarities of combination in melody and harmony, noticed in the music of various climates and localities, and founded on the peculiarities of education, constitution and taste of the inhabitants; the peculiar features or cast discovered in music at various periods in the same country, and in the music of different contemporary composers in the same country, arising from the difference of their disposition, taste, or genius; the peculiar combination of the features which render music suitable to various objects, and applications of the nature of the sensations to be excited—all the peculiarities arising from these numerous circumstances have been expressed by one and the same term, *style*. Hence we talk of the Italian, of the German, and of the French styles of music; and of the styles of Pergolese, Gluck, Piccini, Mozart, Haydn, Cimarosa and Beethoven. Hence, also, we hear of the style appropriate to the church, of the dramatic style, romance, ballad, and bravura style; of the grave and sublime, the gentle and beautiful, the light and ornamental styles, &c.

The styles of musical composition being thus considered to differ materially from each other, and the word being used to denote differences founded on an infinite number of dissimilar circumstances—at one time a single feature or quality, at another a combination of these—it results that their number is exceedingly large, and often leads to confusion.

For this reason it is found necessary to group them under a limited number of heads; and on reference to some recent

works, in which the subject has been treated with due attention, it will be seen that the word is more particularly employed to denote the peculiar combination of features exhibited by each kind of music, which imparts to it a peculiar cast, and thereby renders it appropriate to particular and specific purposes. It would, no doubt, be a matter of congratulation should the word be exclusively used in that sense; for the division, resulting from that circumstance, appears to us to be founded on a just view of the subject, and likely to lead to considerable advantage. Each of the kinds of composition thus admitted, is characterised by a peculiar cast in the melody and in the arrangement of the ideas; by a specific character in the harmony, and by a form of development suited only to the particular application which is to be made of it, but which, nevertheless, does not exclude those peculiarities that enable us to distinguish the music of the various schools, and the manner of the various masters. It is very plain that the ensemble thus formed requires to be designated by a special term, and as none better than the word *style* could be selected, and as the latter has already been used for that purpose by the best authorities in the art, we cannot help believing that it would be advantageous to use it in no other sense, and to employ different words to designate the other subjects to which that term has been applied. By this means precision in language will be gained, and confusion obviated.

In conformity with these views, we distinguish in vocal music three separate styles of composition; the church, the chamber, and the dramatic styles. The first is of a serious, majestic, and grave cast; the dramatic is more diversified in its features, more or less imitative, and appropriate to the excitement of the passions; and the chamber style is of a lighter and amusing cast. In instrumental music an equal number of styles may be established, though in the church and dramatic departments, instruments are only used for the purposes of accompaniment, and to enhance the effects of the voice. In each of those styles instrumental music derives its characteristic features from the same circumstances that impart a physiognomy to the vocal. As its object is similar to that of the latter, it follows that, when used for the purposes of accompaniment, or when resorted to separately and independently of the voice, its cast or features must be the same. Nevertheless, instrumental music differs somewhat in each style from vocal music, in consequence of the peculiar effects obtained from the particular and specific power and tone of the instrument or instruments employed.

From the preceding remarks it will be perceived that the peculiarities of each style—those circumstances which impart to each its particular physiognomy or individuality—are derived

from certain organic qualities or features appertaining to it alone, and without which its existence could not be detected. These qualities have a closer relationship to the expression, and are founded on peculiarities of modulation, of rhythm, of melody, and of harmony, and constitute what are termed *characters*. They are divided into two classes. 1. General characters. 2. Particular characters. The first have reference to our affections,—imparting a gay or a melancholy cast to the music; to the degree in which we experience those affections,—giving rise to the vivacity or soft expression of the music; to the tone in which we express those affections,—which imparts a cast either of grandeur and sublimity, or simplicity and vivacity in the composition. Each of these states has a medium character, and may be combined with the others in a variety of ways, enabling the musician to produce a considerable variety of mixed characters. The principal of these mixed characters are, 1. The *tragic* character, which unites melancholy with strength and sublimity. 2. The *buffa*, or comic, which unites liveliness with vivacity and familiarity. 3. The *semi-character*, which combines the medium situations.

The particular or special characters have reference to a diversity of circumstances totally unconnected with our moral affections; as the habits of a people, of a class of individuals, or even of a single individual; their occupations; the use to be made of the music, &c. Hence, music is said to present a religious character, a military character, a pastoral character, the Italian, French, Spanish, German character, &c. In some of these cases *character* is made synonymous with style, but in a more restricted sense. "In order that a piece of music," says Mr. Castil Blaze, "may possess a *character*, it is not alone required that it should express the sense of the words to which it is applied, or even the dramatic situation; for a symphony performed in a concert room, and which is destitute of words, may nevertheless possess a character. It is necessary that its expression should present something peculiar, which seizes upon the ear and soul of the hearer, and makes him believe that the sentiment intended to be expressed could not be rendered in any other way. By character, therefore, is understood a certain originality which is immediately perceived; which serves to distinguish a piece from all other pieces; which elevates it above many others better made perhaps, and possessing more merit than itself, but deprived of the one appertaining to it; finally, which gives it the stamp of immortality."

According to the foregoing views of the subject, therefore, the word style should be made use of to denote the *ensemble* of the features and circumstances which render a musical com-

position suited to particular purposes, while the word character should denote each of the features by which the piece is individualized.

But although the restriction of these two words to the foregoing sense would be calculated to obviate much of the confusion prevailing in reference to the use of the first, yet a perusal of many publications on the art will show, that on this subject unanimity of opinion does not exist. Some writers, for example, though applying the word style to designate the kind of music suited to different objects, use the term synonymously with *character*, to signify the cast of the composition; while Dr. Crotch apparently understands the word in the latter sense only, establishing, as he does, his division of styles on the characteristic features or peculiar physiognomy of the piece, and recognizing the existence of three—the sublime, the beautiful and the ornamental. It is extraordinary, and very much to be regretted, that these writers should not have perceived that, by using the word as a substitute for character, they would be obliged, in order to be consistent with their views, to admit the existence of as many different styles of composition as there are different characters; that they should not have seen that by character is only meant a particular something which imparts a quality to the piece; and that the kind of music proper for the church, the stage, or the chamber, being recognised not by one quality only, but by a variety of these, it is impossible to confound the two circumstances, and to designate them by the same name, without running the risk of introducing much confusion in musical language. The sublime is not the only character suited to the church, since sacred music, which is regarded as the type of the sublime style, may admit of the beautiful, and even of the ornamental, and yet present the ensemble proper for divine service; and dramatic music may admit of the beautiful and ornamental, and sometimes of the sublime. To us it appears evident, then, that the sublime, beautiful and ornamental, have reference to the particular qualities or characters of the music, and not to the application of the latter to the church, drama, or chamber; or to the combination of those qualities which renders the piece suited to these various purposes; that if we employ the word style to denote the ensemble of qualities, characters, or feature, which render the music suited either for the church, stage, or chamber, we must not use it to denote the features themselves; and, finally, that if we do so—if we use it sometimes in one sense, sometimes in another—we are led to the necessity of admitting that the various styles are characterised by other styles; that the church style is characterised by the sublime style, the dramatic by the beautiful and ornamental, &c. Certainly modern languages are not so poor as to possess only one word to designate two things

so different as the kind of music suited, owing to the combination of features it presents, to a particular object, and the separate qualities or features which enable it to be so applied, and by which each species of composition is individualized; in short, to designate at times a single property, at others a combination of circumstances more or less dissimilar, but all tending to one particular purpose. If, however, the word style must continue to be regarded as synonymous with character, it would be proper to select another to denote the combination of characters to which we have so often referred; and *manner* might be used to signify the peculiar features discovered in the compositions of each school and of each musician, and by which those compositions are individualized.

This, however, is a matter of small importance at present; and as Dr. Crotch's chapter on what he denominates Styles, contains many interesting remarks on their distinctive features, we shall not enlarge any more on the impropriety of using that term synonymously with character, but proceed to the consideration of those remarks.

In reference to painting, Sir Joshua Reynolds speaks only of the sublime and ornamental styles; but Dr. Crotch, after maintaining that there exists a general harmony and correspondence in our sensations, and a similarity of effects among all the arts, remarks, that what the illustrious painter calls the sublime, includes the beautiful. He agrees with Price, the author of an admirable essay on the picturesque, that the sublime and beautiful have been accurately described in an Essay (Burke's), the early splendour of which not even the full meridian blaze of its illustrious author was able to eclipse. Hence, he thinks, that music, like painting, may be divided into three styles, the sublime, the beautiful, and the ornamental, which he regards as being analogous to the picturesque. The following extract from Price, as quoted by Dr. Crotch, on the latter style, will apply with equal force to the ornamental.

"The picturesque has a character not less separate and distinct than either the sublime or the beautiful; nor less independent of the art of painting. The term picturesque (as we may judge from its etymology) is applied only to objects of sight; and, indeed, in so confined a manner as to be supposed merely to have a reference to the art from which it is named. I am well convinced, however, that the name and reference only are limited and uncertain, and that the qualities which make objects picturesque, are not only as distinct as those which make them beautiful or sublime, but are equally extended to all our sensations, by whatever organs they are received; and that music (though it appears like a solecism) may be as truly picturesque, according to the general principles of picturesqueness, as it may be beautiful or sublime according to those of beauty or sublimity. The English word picturesque naturally draws the mind towards pictures; and from that partial and confined view of the subject, what is in truth only an illustration of picturesqueness, becomes the foun-

dation of it. The words sublime and beautiful have not the same etymological reference to any one visible art, and therefore are applied to objects of the other senses. Sublime, indeed, in the language from which it is taken, means high; and, therefore, perhaps in strictness, should relate to objects of sight only; yet we no more scruple to call one of Handel's Chorusses sublime, than Corelli's Pastorale beautiful. But should any person simply, and without qualifying expressions, call a capricious movement of Dominico Scarlatti, or Haydn, picturesque, he would, with great reason, be laughed at; for it is not a term applied to sounds: yet such a movement, from its sudden, unexpected, and abrupt transitions, from a certain playful wildness of character, and an appearance of irregularity, is no less analogous to similar scenery in nature, than the concerto, or the chorus, to what is grand or beautiful to the eye."

These three styles are sometimes distinct and sometimes combined. The sublime is founded on principles of vastness and incomprehensibility.

"The word sublime originally signifies high, lofty, elevated; and this style, accordingly, never descends to any thing small, delicate, light, pretty, playful, or comic. The grandest style in music is therefore the sacred style—that of the church and oratorio—for it is least inclined to levity, where levity is properly inadmissible, and where the words convey the most awful and striking images. Infinity, and what is next to it, immensity, are among the most efficient causes of this quality, when we hear innumerable voices and instruments sounding the praises of God in solemn and becoming strains, the most sublime image that can fill the mind seldom fails to present itself—that of the heavenly host described in the Holy Scriptures."

Uniformity is not only compatible with the sublime, but is often the cause of it; and simplicity, and its opposite, intricacy, when on a large scale, are sublime.

As regards the second style, the existence of which is admitted by Dr. Crotch, he remarks, that as beauty in all the arts is the result of softness, smoothness, delicacy, smallness, gentle undulations, symmetry and the like, it follows, that when in music the melody is vocal and flowing, the measure symmetrical, the harmony simple and intelligible, and the style of the whole, soft, delicate and sweet, it may with as much propriety be called beautiful, as a small, perfect, Grecian temple, or a landscape of Claude Lorraine. Finally, the ornamental style is the result of roughness, playful intricacy, and abrupt variations.

"In painting, splendid draperies, intricate architecture, gold or silver cups and vases, and all such objects, are ornamental; aged heads, old hovels, cottages, or mills, ruined temples or castles, rough animals, peasants at a fair, and the like, are picturesque. In music, eccentric and difficult melody; rapid, broken, and varied rhythm; wild and unexpected modulation, indicate this third style."

The three styles in question are seldom found distinct. The sublime and beautiful, though in appearance too opposite in their characteristic features to allow of a union, are sometimes

found combined with each other in the same composition. This is exemplified in those pieces in which the melody is simple and slow, the harmony full and plain, and the expression chaste and solemn. Compositions exhibiting such a combination of the sublime and beautiful, a combination which forms one of the higher walks of the musical art, are frequently met with in the writings of the great masters. The sublime and ornamental may also be combined, as is illustrated in those chorusses in which the voices are dignified, while the accompaniments are varied and playful. The beautiful and ornamental are still more frequently blended. The sublime, says Price, by its solemnity takes off from the loveliness of beauty; while the ornamental style corrects the languor of beauty and the horror of sublimity, but renders their impression less forcible. It is the coquetry of nature; it makes beauty more amusing, more varied, more playful, but also

“Less winning soft, less amiably mild.”

According to Dr. Crotch, wherever there is a flowing and elegant melody, with playful and ingenious accompaniments, this union of the beautiful and ornamental styles must be apparent; it forms the leading characteristic of modern music. The three styles are sometimes found blended. This, however, rarely occurs without a sensible predominance of that in which the composer excels, or which is the favourite style of the age in which he lives.

Dr. Crotch next examines the relative rank and value of each style, which he remarks are deduced from a consideration of the mental labour employed in the formation, and the mental capacities required for the comprehension and enjoyment of the latter. We have already stated that a great difference of opinion is found to exist in various countries relatively to the most pleasing and effective music. In the same country, also, the most opposite opinions prevail relative to the same subject, and will probably ever continue to do so, because taste in music, as indeed in the arts generally, is modified by temperaments, education, and a variety of physical and moral causes.

“Every style of music (Dr. Crotch remarks), has its votaries and champions, both writers and critics, who, like true knights of old, contend that the idol of their admiration shall not only receive the honour due, but be allowed to be unrivalled, pre-eminent, and perfect. A few can be touched only by the grave solemnity of the church style. The oratorios of Handel are with more the chief source of delight. The modern Italian opera is by many accounted the only school for vocal melody. Some prefer a glee to all other music; the concert sinfonia is sufficient for others; while the compositions of the day for the piano forte is all the music that is known to many. As all styles are thus praised, so all are condemned. Accord-

ingly, we read and hear continually of the dry and pedantic strains of the church, the tedious heaviness of the oratorio, the trifling puerility of the opera, the excruciating dissonance of the German *sinfonia*, and the affectation and extravagance of instrumental music for the chamber."

Nor is this all. Taste in music is ever varying in the same country, and the style which pleased at one period, is no longer found to do so at another. This was well exemplified some years ago in England, where the utter dislike to all improvement was carried to such excess, that on the first introduction of Haydn's music, it was considered so wild and out of keeping with what English ears had been accustomed to, that an elegant writer and composer, Mr. Jackson of Exeter, compared it to the ravings of a bedlamite.* Nor is it less conclusively shown by the change that has taken place in France and Italy within the last fifty years. Compare the music of Rameau or Lulli with that of Herold and Auber, and the difference will be immediately discovered, in reference to the former of these countries; while the great relish felt in Italy for the music of the German school, and its influence on the compositions of her own musicians, indicates the change that has taken place there. The circumstance is easily accounted for, as, independently of the fact that there is a fashion in music as in every thing else, that every period of ten years has some forms or turns of melody which are peculiar to it, and grow out of fashion before it expires, the science is in a state of constant improvement; the power of execution increases; effects are produced which formerly were unknown; the cultivation of the art is more general; and the musical understanding and taste becomes every day more refined and exacting. It is plain, that these progressive changes must necessarily occasion some modification in the music calculated to correspond to the state of taste and science at each successive period. Mr. Fétis has also very properly remarked, that music is founded upon emotions which are more lively as they are more varied; that these emotions are quickly effaced; and that consequently the necessity of novelty is more felt in this than in any other art. This difference of taste for various kinds of music which has existed at different periods, or which is discovered to exist among different nations, depends often on the nature of the occupation and on the organic and acquired disposition of individuals, as well as on the degree of success with which the latter have cultivated either of the departments of the art. Nations, like individuals, when of a serious turn of mind, or engaged in serious pursuits, will naturally prefer music of a corresponding character; while others, of a different disposition or differently occupied,

* Gardiner, 408.

or the former, if a change takes place in their pursuits, will give the preference to music of an opposite stamp. The different characters of German, Italian and French music, will serve to illustrate the truth of these positions. Again, nations and individuals who have cultivated the church style with some success, and failed completely in, or have not cultivated the dramatic and chamber styles, may be expected to decide in favour of the former, while the converse of this will be found in those who have succeeded in the latter, and been less successful in the former style. To this circumstance we may attribute the peculiar taste of English musicians, and of Dr. Crotch among others. This gentleman does not hesitate to avow a preference in favour of the sublime style. He remarks, that from the time of Longinus, at least, who wrote on the subject in the early part of the third century, the invention of whatever is sublime has been esteemed the greatest effort of the human mind; and that this style, which is emphatically denominated the elevated, the lofty style, may well be called the highest walk of any art. He considers the ornamental as the lowest and least estimated of the three styles.

"The well known rebuke from his master of the young Grecian painter, for having decked his Helen with ornaments, because he had not the skill to make her beautiful, is a striking illustration of the inferiority of this style. Difficult as execution, in music or in painting, may appear to the ignorant, it is held in comparative contempt by those who seek for the forms, or the sounds, that can only be produced or enjoyed by the mind.

"But if, with Burke, we separate the sublime and beautiful into two styles, which shall we prefer? Surely the sublime, as requiring most mind in the person gratified, and in the author of the gratification. The mental operations required for writing an epic poem, designing a cathedral, painting a storm, or composing a full chorus, must be greater and more extraordinary than those which produce a sonnet, a shrine, a miniature, or an ariette. Why was the lecturer in a sister art so anxious to impress on his pupils the merits of Michael Angelo? Not because he is generally allowed to be the most pleasing of painters; not because he is the last painter, or the favourite of the present day; but because he excelled all others in the sublime style—the pure sublime—not including, in this case, beauty. How many would pass by his productions who would admire, and duly appreciate, the truth of Wilkie, or the minuteness of Ostade!"

"Admiration, wonder, awe, and even terror, are produced in the mind by the sublime style; beauty pleases, soothes, and enamours; ornament dazzles, delights, amuses, and awakens curiosity. Will it not, then, be readily granted, that the value of any style, singly or predominating if combined, may be ascertained by the nature of its impressions? To be amused and delighted is a meaner enjoyment than that of being soothed and charmed; while both are less noble to the mind than feeling itself elevated and expanded. The humorous incidents of a drama make men laugh; the tender and happy parts excite the smile of approbation; but the tragic scenes petrify them into silent, serious, breathless attention. The superiority of the tragedy over the comedy, and of both over the farce, is therefore obvious, though the majority of every audience should deny the statement."

According to this view of the subject, music may be regard-

ed as sublime, if it inspires veneration; beautiful, if it pleases; ornamental, if it amuses. Whoever, then, were the greatest composers of the sublime style, they are to be regarded as treading in the highest walks of the art; those of the beautiful occupy an inferior stage near the summit; but those of the ornamental are far below. When two of these styles are combined, the union of the sublime and beautiful ranks first, one of the sublime and ornamental next, and one of the beautiful and ornamental last; and when all are combined, the predominance of any one over the others must be regarded with a reference to its own peculiar value. Such a combination of the three as preserves their due subordination, not permitting the beautiful to take precedence of the sublime, or the ornamental of either of the others, deserves the highest praise—so says Dr. Crotch. But we shall return to this subject presently.

As must have been perceived, the preceding remarks apply in a more particular manner to musical compositions. There is, however, another and distinct department of the art, to which they will in some measure be found applicable—we mean the executive. We need hardly remind the musical reader, that each style or character of composition requires a peculiar mode of execution, and that the success of the piece, the certainty of the effects it is expected to produce, will depend, in a considerable measure, upon the strict adherence to the appropriate mode; aided by the talents of the performer, the selection of the instrument on which it is performed, or with which it is accompanied, as well as the key and time in which it is written.

It will be unnecessary to enter here into a long discussion relative to the characteristic features of the mode of execution appropriate to each style of composition, or to the other requisites we have mentioned. We must, therefore, content ourselves with a few remarks on the subject. The sublime style requires simplicity of manner, an avoidance of extraneous ornaments, a fine and pure tone, a dignified and, to use a French expression, an enlarged mode of performance (*jeu large*), suitable to the solemn and majestic characters of the composition, and the exalted nature of the object to which that kind of music is particularly, if not exclusively, appropriate. The beautiful style requires sweetness, simplicity also, fine and correct expression, purity of tone, and, when the nature of the passage demands it, pathos; while the ornamental style requires lightness, ease and purity, and admits, when the music is composed for one or more principal instruments or voices, of a greater or less number of extempore embellishments suited to the character of the piece. These different modes of execution may be exemplified by a reference to those appropriate to

sacred, dramatic, and chamber music. The first must be performed with due regard to grandeur of expression as well as purity and simplicity of manner. Chamber music, according as it is of a light, gay, and lively character, suited to the dance or convivial intercourse; or of a tender, soft, and melancholic cast, suited to the expression of the softer emotions of the mind; or, finally, of a brilliant and vivacious character, suited to the display of the warmer and more impetuous feelings, requires quick, rhythmical accents, or a neat accentuation, a pure intonation, softness, feeling, truth of expression,—without the rigid solemnity or grandeur of the church style; or a sprightly and easy execution, and a sparing use, except under particular circumstances, as for examples in a solo or cadenza, of embellishments which but too often tend to conceal the sense of the melody or impair the correctness and truth of the harmony. Finally, dramatic music, uniting the characters of the beautiful and ornamental styles, requires, according to the nature of the piece, an attention to the peculiarities of the mode of execution suited to each of these styles; but admits, oftener than chamber music, of those florid and meretricious embellishments, which, when introduced with taste and judgment, are of great service, not only by placing in relief the peculiar powers of the performer, but by obviating the monotony necessarily resulting from the frequent repetition of the same musical phrase.

Our musical readers must have all perceived the difference of results obtained from the same music when it is performed by competent musicians, or by those of an inferior grade. By the former the intentions of the author are at once discovered and competently rendered with appropriate spirit and facility; the effect of the whole piece is enhanced by the neat execution of difficult passages, and the expression and accent of each phrase are correctly given; while the performance of the other class of musicians is monotonous, and characterised by an absence of lights and shades, of true expression, force, grace, ease and correctness of accentuation. It is one thing to play the notes of a musical composition, and another to play them in such a way as to impart to them sense and life; and we feel confident that few individuals endowed with true musical feeling, and sufficiently experienced in the art to appreciate the beauties contained in the compositions of the great masters, have been so fortunate as not to hear these compositions performed in a way so insipid and incorrect, as to give them the appearance of works of inferior merit, and destroy the effects elicited from them by more competent hands. That there is also a difference in the effects obtained from the same music when performed on different instruments, is a fact that can admit of no doubt. Experience relative to the quality of tone

and to the diapason of various instruments teaches that each of these possesses characteristic properties, by means of which it is individualized and distinguished from all the others, which renders it suitable to the expression of particular accents, and imparts to it, as it were, a particular language. It is clear that each emotion or feeling must be rendered by particular instruments possessing the quality of tone and diapason appropriate to those emotions and feelings, and by no other; and that a musician who would not bear the necessity of this in mind, would not only fail in his performance, but be often led to commit the strangest incongruities. With as much propriety might he entrust the expression of the strong and violent passions natural to the male sex to a youthful and feminine voice, or the tender feelings of youth and innocence to a powerful and deep bass voice, as to expect from one instrument the effects naturally produced by another. In short, instruments which by the quality of their tone and by their compass are suited to the expression of certain feelings, cannot with propriety be applied to for the expression of feelings of a different description; and music presenting the sublime character would immediately cease to do so, if performed on a flageolet or other instrument of that kind, while light and gay pieces would assume a different character if performed on the organ, double bass or trombone.

Differences of effect equally marked will be found to result according to the key in which the music is composed. As many of our readers may perhaps know already, the term *key* is made use of to designate any system of notes which regards a certain tone in the musical scale as its base or centre, to which all adjacent harmonies gravitate or tend.

It is plain, therefore, that the relative situation of tones and semi-tones in the gamut of each key, and the quality of the key-note depending on its position in the scale being somewhat different, each of these keys will be found to have a peculiar complexion that causes it to be easily distinguished from every other; assimilates it to the tones naturally elicited in the various passions and feelings of the mind, and consequently renders it applicable to the various styles and characters of music. Mr. Gardiner has carefully analyzed several of the twenty-four major and minor keys we possess, and pointed out the sentiments they are calculated to express. He shows that the key of F is rich, mild, sober and contemplative; while its relative, D minor, possesses the same qualities, but of a heavier and darker cast; more doleful, solemn and grand. The key of C is bold, vigorous and commanding, suited to the expression of war and enterprise; its relative, A minor, plaintive, but not feeble. G is gay and sprightly; its relative, E minor, persuasive, soft and

tender. D is ample, grand and noble, and is suited to the loftiest purposes; its relative, B minor, bewailing. A is golden, warm and sunny; F sharp minor, mournfully grand. E in sharps is bright, pellucid, feminine; adapted to brilliant subjects. G minor is meek and pensive, replete with melancholy. E flat is full, mellow, soft and beautiful. C minor is complaining, possessing something of the whining cant of B minor. A flat is unassuming, gentle, soft, delicate and tender; F minor, religious, penitential and gloomy, and D flat major, awfully dark. It is evident, therefore, that according to the effect desired to be produced—the object for which the music is intended—in short, according to the style and character of the composition, one or other of these keys must be preferred to the rest.

The same attention must be paid to the selection of the rhythm, both as regards the rapidity of the movement and the division of the time. Rapid movements impart an idea of lively feelings; slow or moderate movements, a feeling of solemnity and gravity, or softness and gentleness. Music measured with two strokes in a bar, if rapid, and when written in a sprightly key, will dispose to a dance; if with three, to a waltz or minuet; if with four, it will be found more sedate; and, according to the degree of rapidity of the movement and the nature of the key, will be appropriate to the expression of melancholic, tender and devout feelings, or to those of a warlike and brilliant character. It is owing to this difference in the effects obtained from the various rhythms, that nothing is more essential to the due performance of music, than adjusting the time to the intention and meaning of the author; for by playing quicker or slower than he desired, his views respecting its effects will be frustrated. "Some of the most striking effects," says Mr. Gardiner, "are produced by the change of time." The slow naturally leads to sorrow, but the gay and lively air excites a joy in us, so that the feet can hardly be restrained from dancing. "Destroy the time, or thwart the measure, (*i. e.* divide the bar differently,) and you rob the strain of its interest and charm." These facts and circumstances show the importance of fixing upon a right time to convey particular effects. It may be remarked, also, that a difference in the effects will be obtained according to the degree of force imparted to the tones, and that the composer must in consequence mark his desires, in that respect, so as to leave little to the discretion of the performers. Mr. Alison observes, that loud sounds are connected with ideas of power and danger; and that many objects in nature, which have such qualities, are distinguished by such sounds. In the human voice all violent and impetuous passions are expressed by loud sounds. On the contrary, soft sounds are connected with ideas of gentleness and delicacy. The contrasts produced by the dif-

ferent degrees of force with which sounds are uttered, form the most prominent effects of musical expression. The rushing of the fortissimo brings with it dread and alarm; but in the pianissimo, the *chiaroscuro* of the art, we feel the opposite sensation.*

The peculiar modes of execution to which we have alluded, have received the denomination of styles. We have then, according to Dr. Crotch, the sublime, the beautiful and the ornamental styles of musical execution, as we have the sublime, the beautiful and ornamental styles of composition; or if, in respect to the latter, we limit the word to signify the kind of music proper for particular objects, we shall have the church, the dramatic and the chamber styles of execution. But although these different styles of execution are, as it were, based on the character of the different styles of composition—although there is in each something peculiar which suits it to the latter, it is found that the modes of execution of the same music, by the performers of various schools, and even by the disciples of the same school, presents some characteristic feature which, independently of the diversity of effects resulting from variety of agility, force, tone, or voice, serve to establish a difference between them. For want, probably, of a better term, the word style has generally been made use of to denote these peculiarities also. Hence we have the style of the Italian, the German and French schools, vocal and instrumental; hence, also, we have the styles of Rode, Spohr, Paganini; of Garcia, Rubini, Nourrit, Garat, Ponchard, and a thousand others we could enumerate.

Having already adverted to the circumstance, that the fondness for the different styles of composition has experienced some changes with the progress of time, it will be needless to notice minutely that part of Dr. Crotch's work which is devoted to the consideration of the subject. We must content ourselves with remarking, that the change has been from the sublime to the ornamental, and that the latter, combined with the beautiful, prevails very generally at the present period in every portion of the musical world. In the music of the ancients, the three styles appear, from the specimens we possess, to have existed.

"The inventor of scientific music (Guido), had all these before him; for however uncertain the dates of many of the airs may be, there is no question as to the existence of national music anterior to the use of harmony. The Hebrew chants, for instance, noticed by Marcello in his Psalms, are said to be very ancient. They were preserved by the Spanish and German Jews, and so strongly resemble the Persian service (which is also likely to be ancient), that a Hebrew high priest, who heard the latter performed by the suite of the Persian caliph, on an embassy at Petersburg, was highly offended, thinking it was done in derision of the Jews. The

* Gardiner, 362.

Chinese are so remarkably tenacious of old customs, that there can scarcely be a doubt of the high antiquity of their airs, or of those of the East Indies, though we do not indeed suppose the monk of Aretino was acquainted with these. The Greek air called Romeka appears to have been modernised in its melody and graces, but not so in its style and measure, which were suited to the dance, which has been an annual commemoration, from time immemorial, of the deliverance by Theseus of the young Greeks from the Minotaur in Crete (1235 years B. C.).

"The airs of the bards and troubadours were performed all over Europe. The air called the Hymn of Roland was composed before the battle of Hastings, being sung by the conqueror's army as it advanced; and the Welsh tunes of David the Prophet, and Sweet Richard, were deciphered from a Welsh manuscript of the eleventh century, and were probably not new when inserted. These, then, I repeat, in their various styles, together with the chants which had existed in the Christian church at least from the fourth century, were equally open to the adoption of the inventor of harmony. In national music, the military, the pastoral, and the dance styles were distinct and appropriate. The difference of their character is not caused by age; they will not increase in sublimity by becoming older; they will not become suitable to sacred subjects."

For several centuries after music had begun to be cultivated with effect and success, the sublime style or character—being that most appropriate for the service of the church, in which alone the art was attended to; being more impressive on individuals living in an age when the domination of the church was nearly absolute and universal; and when the disposition of the mass of the population, all over the civilized world, was marked by a religious tendency; and being that which required less power of execution—retained the ascendancy. Hence among the scientific compositions (we say nothing of national music, which is generally unscientific, and retains its character of simplicity, *naïveté*, vivacity, or military brilliancy through ages), that have been handed down to us, from before the time of Guido to the latter part of the sixteenth century, we find little or nothing appertaining to the beautiful and ornamental. Writers who, like Dr. Crotch, give a decided preference to the sublime style, dwell with rapture on the composers of those days—on the Ambrosian and Gregorian chants, the compositions of De Prez and of Talis; the psalms used and composed by the early reformers and their immediate successors; the collections of Boyce, Tye, Orlando di Lasso, Palestrina, Farrant, Aldrich, Bird, Carissimi, as affording examples of the pure sublime.

When, however, at the period last mentioned (the latter part of the sixteenth century), the taste for the drama began to acquire a footing in Italy, and subsequently in other parts of Europe; when subjects of a secular character were generally selected for representation; and when the Motett and the Madrigal, which had long been cultivated, and combined sublimity with a considerable, and perhaps equal portion of beauty, had arrived at perfection, the beautiful style began to share with the sublime

the attention of the public, at length succeeded in supplanting it in all secular music, and even gradually insinuated itself in the service of the church.

"Music (says Dr. Crotch) has been gradually, though not imperceptibly, losing its character of sublimity ever since. Improvements have indeed been made in the contexture of the score, in the flow of melody, in the accentuation and expression of the words, in the beauty of the solo, and the delicacy of the accompaniment."

In the cultivation of that style, as applied to the church, Monteverde, Converso, Marenzio, Emilio del Cavaliere, Bird, Morley, Dowland, &c. attained distinction; while the invention or renewal of the recitative and of the aria, by Peri, Cavalli and Certi, gave an impulse to the taste for the beautiful style, contributed powerfully to its success among all ranks of society, and tended to limit the sublime style, either pure or modified, to the church or to the oratorio.

The taste for the beautiful style prevailed undisturbed during a whole century. At the end of this time, however, the cantata came, from which the sublime was wholly withdrawn, and a style more appropriate to love-ditties was adopted. The vocal melody became still more beautiful; and the ornamental style was invented, or to speak more correctly, adopted in the accompaniment of the violincello to the cantata, and in the various instruments for a full band in the opera song. The ornamental style was first introduced by Alessandro Scarlatti, of Naples, who flourished in the latter part of the seventeenth century.

"Scarlatti, (says Dr. Crotch), wrote in various styles, but excelled particularly in Cantatas, of which he was at once the most voluminous and ingenious composer. '*Fortunati miei martiri*,' is replete with elegance and originality, and might well be taken for an opera song of Handel, who has indeed adopted some of its cadences, and frequently made this great master his model. The character of the melody, particularly that of the accompaniment, is quite unlike all the music we have hitherto noticed. Instrumental music for keyed instruments had, as we have seen, been made long before; but this composer seems to have been one of the first to apply the ornamental style to vocal chamber music, and to the opera full band; his son, Domenico Scarlatti, carrying the same style to the greatest possible excess in his harpsichord lessons.

At the same time with, and subsequently to the Scarlattis, we find Stradella, Corelli, Rogers, Blow, Child, Croft, Boyce, Locke, Duranti, Pergolesi, Haasse, Terradilla, Purcel, Leo, Jomelli, Sacchini, Piccini, Sebastian Bach, Paesiello, Handel, Gluck, Haydn, Mozart, Mehul, Betthoven, and the whole host of modern operatic composers in Italy, France and Germany, all of whom have cultivated the beautiful more or less combined with the ornamental style; though some among them have endeavoured, in their church compositions, to imitate the sublime style of their predecessors.

"The commencement of the eighteenth century furnishes the student with abundance for his contemplation, both from the quantity and quality of its productions. Here he will find the organ fugue (a species of music excelling all others in learned and ingenious combinations) at its highest state of excellence. The ornamental style had not become too predominant, either in the oratorio or opera. The sublime prevailed in the one, and the beautiful in the other. The oratorios of this period may on this account be said to have arrived at perfection. Whatever improvements may have afterwards been made, were in the instrumental department, not in the vocal; in the overtures or the accompaniments, not in the scientific contexture of chorusses, or the chaste melody of the songs; in the ornamental, not in the sublime or beautiful styles. In the opera, however, the expression of the vocal melody was not yet sufficiently light for secular, and especially comic subjects, although the sublime and every thing scientific had been carefully excluded; the instrumental accompaniment had not acquired its transparency and playfulness of decoration; ornament was not sufficiently advanced in vigour to support the feeble steps of beauty bereft of her aged companion. It has, however, been increasing in strength and importance ever since, and has brought the opera to the state in which we now find it; more light, brilliant, and varied than ever; more scientific and more dramatic, though perhaps less replete with beautiful melody than it has been. Of the improvement in the instrumental department of the opera, that of concert music was a natural result. While science was banished, the overture and concerto remained uninteresting; but when this was re-admitted, and the sublime occasionally introduced, the modern style of instrumental music became, as such, much superior to what it had been. The ornamental style is necessarily predominant in instrumental music. But in solo concertos for particular instruments, and in piano-forte music in general, it is more obtrusive than in the concert sinfonia, or in the quartett for the chamber."

From the circumstance of this change of taste, from the fact, that while the beautiful and ornamental have thus advanced in perfection and repute, the sublime has been banished, or at least greatly neglected, in England; that sacred music is not improved, while secular is; and that in modern music the instrumental style is greatly advanced, or perhaps arrived at perfection, while the progress of the vocal is not so apparent; Dr. Crotch concludes that the art is on the decline in that country; and as the same revolution is found to have occurred in the musical world generally, it follows that, in his opinion, the art is on the decline every where.

This, however, is a position which affords ample room for discussion, and on the correctness of which a difference of opinion is fairly allowable; because, whatever may be thought by some of the exalted nature of the sublime style, whether or not they regard it as the highest walk of the musical art, it yet remains to be proved, that instrumental music is as greatly inferior to vocal music in its essence—that sacred music is in itself as greatly superior to secular—and that the church style is as superior to the dramatic, as Dr. Crotch would lead us to understand; or, at least, sufficiently so to justify the views he has adopted relative to the present low condition of the art. The question may be

examined in relation to Europe generally, and to England in particular.

Dr. C. appears to us to be rather an enthusiast in favour of church music, and to hold in too light esteem every other species of composition, from the higher grades of the dramatic to the light fugitive pieces of chamber music. He somewhere tells us, that the musical student must not, with some writers, imagine that music is continually improving; that every age is superior to the preceding; and that every new composer is greater than his predecessors. In regard to the latter point, no one, we are sure, will feel disposed to refuse coinciding with him, because it is impossible to be ignorant of the fact, that the superiority and success of a man depend on his natural talents and his acquirements, and that neither of these is influenced by the relative period of his birth, except so far as it may chance to place him in intercourse with distinguished individuals, whose society or writings may aid in the development of his faculties. But in reference to the other points, facts of a more positive and convincing character than those he has furnished, must be adduced before we can be satisfied of the superiority of the composers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries over those of the present day.

To the practical musician it is doubtless hardly necessary to remark, that new effects of modulation, harmony, melody or rhythm are every day obtained; and that the last century and the early part of the present have been adorned by a combination of musical geniuses such as the world had never before witnessed, and who have furnished immense collections of compositions, which prove the delight of connoisseurs,—the number of whom has increased prodigiously within that period. With these facts before us, we cannot help suspecting that Dr. Crotch belongs to that class of individuals who are so wedded to every thing ancient, that they do not concede to the moderns any credit for whatever they may achieve; and experiencing some reluctance in conceding to him the correctness of his views relative to the decline of the art. Had the sacred, dramatic and chamber styles continued such as they were in olden times, and had the sublime species of music nevertheless lost its favour in the estimation of musicians, there would have been some grounds for such a conclusion; for sacred was then far superior to secular music, and a change of sentiment in relation to the relative value of these two species would have implied a decline in the art. But such, fortunately, is very far from being the case; for while the sacred has remained stationary, the other styles have attained a degree of perfection surpassing all expectation, and are productive of effects which, though perhaps differing from those obtained from the sacred style, are not less powerful and extraordinary.

The whole question then resolves itself into, whether the prevalence of taste for a particular style, and the greater progress in it than in others, indicate or not a decline in the art; in other words, whether one style is preferable to the others, and requires greater talents, natural and acquired, in the composer, and more capacity, experience and taste, in those who prefer it? Now, for our part, we frankly admit, that we do not belong to that class of individuals who deplore the change that has taken place in the musical art, and whose taste, like that of Lord Mount Edgumbe, has not wavered in the slightest degree for a great number of years. So far from doing so, we acknowledge that we believe a change may occur; that improvements may take place in one department of music, while the others remain stationary; that every generation may have a different opinion respecting the superiority of a particular style, without being taxed by their successors with possessing less correctness of taste and judgment than themselves; and that these circumstances do not prove a decline, such as is contended for by Dr. Crotch. Each style presents a combination of beauties, and is productive of effects which, though they may differ from those obtained from the others, may nevertheless be entitled to equal praise, and enlist a host of admirers, who, from long practice in the art, united to strong musical feeling, may be presumed to possess equal taste. It is not right, then, to assume one style as the beau ideal of the art, and to regard it so far superior to the others, that any change in the degree of its supremacy must be held in the light of a misfortune; because each style possessing, as we have stated, merits peculiarly its own, the preference, which in the revolution of time is given to it, indicates a change of taste, and nothing more. While on this subject, it may be proper to remark that Dr. Burney, whose authority as an erudite musician and able critic stands very high in England, and cannot be repudiated by Dr. Crotch, has expressed an opinion contrasting very strongly with that advocated by the latter gentleman. On this account, as well as owing to the circumstance that, being entertained by an English writer it must be of much value to us, we cannot forbear to notice it, and to recommend it to the serious reflections of Dr. Crotch, and of those who may feel inclined to join him in sentiment. In the Memoirs of the Doctor, recently published by his daughter, Madame D'Arblay, we find the record of a conversation which took place between the former and Lord and Lady Darnley. After remarking, in answer to his noble opponents, who expressed sovereign contempt for what he had called modern refinements, "that they should then call these modern changes of style and taste; for *what one party calls refinements, the other, of course, constantly calls corruption and deteriora-*

tion," the learned historian of music added, that ingenious men cannot have been idle during a century; and that the language of sound is never stationary, any more than that of conversation and books. "New modes of expression—new ideas from new discoveries and inventions—required new phrases; and in the cultivation of instruments, as well as of the voice, emulation would produce novelty, which, above all things, is wanted in music. And to say that the symphonies of Haydn, and the compositions of Mozart and Beethoven, have no merit, because they are not like Handel, Corelli and Geminiani; or to say that the singing of a Pacchierotti, a Marchese, a Banti or a Billington, in their several styles, is necessarily inferior to singers and compositions of the days of Handel; is supposing time to stand still."

But, independently of what precedes in reference to the impropriety of pronouncing that the art has declined, because taste has changed, we must be allowed to remark, that so far as we are able to judge, it yet remains to be proved, that the genius, mental energies, knowledge and depth of feeling required for the composition of music belonging to the higher walks of the dramatic or chamber styles, are inferior to those required for the sacred or sublime style. In the other fine arts, the conception and execution of pieces which, strictly speaking, come within the category of the sublime, may require and indicate that loftiness of thought,—that grandeur of imagination,—those mental efforts,—which serve to elevate that class of composition far above all the rest. In painting, for example, the works of Michael Angelo, Dominichino, Pietro di Cortona, Julio Romano, Raphael, and A. Carracci, impart to the observer a consciousness of the grandeur of their designs, and of the loftiness of the mind that conceived them, and presided over their execution; and show that those great masters have been able "to get above all singular forms, local customs, particularities, and details of every kind;" that they possessed that nobleness of conception which goes beyond any thing in the mere exhibition even of perfect form, and succeeded in animating and dignifying the figures with intellectual grandeur, and impressing the appearance of philosophic wisdom or heroic virtue. In these respects the works of the painters we have named are of a far superior stamp to those of Coreggio, Guido, Carlo Maratti, Titian, Vandyke, Leonardo da Vinci, and other artists who have aimed at the beautiful, and whose productions, elegant as they may be in detail, execution and colouring, are destitute of that loftiness and grandeur of design which characterise those of the former. The difference is still more striking if we compare the works of the first class with such of those of Paul Veronese, Tintoretto, Rembrandt, Salvator Rosa, Teniers, Brower and Ostade, as appertain to the picturesque or ornamental style; for here the design is of a still

inferior degree in point of grandeur, and the composition is more remarkable for the singularity or luxuriance of the details and ornaments, and for the brilliant and exuberant imagination manifested in their co-ordination. "All these painters," as Sir Joshua Reynolds says, "have in general the same right, in different degrees, to the name of a painter, which a satirist, an epigrammatist, a sonneteer, a writer of pastorals or descriptive poetry has to that of a poet." But in music the case is, we think, very different, for it is impossible to recognize between the class of music denominated sublime, and the other department of the art we have mentioned—the higher grade of the dramatic—that line of demarcation founded on the difference of genius, grandeur of thought, and mental labour, required in the composer, which exist between the different styles of the sister art. Let the reader examine the secular compositions of Haydn, Beethoven, Mozart, Mehul, Weber and Rossini, and compare them with the sacred works of the same or other writers, and he will have little reason we believe to conclude, that the requisites for the latter are greater than those for the former. Let him compare one of Beethoven's symphonies, or Weber's *Oberon*, or *Der Freischütz*, or Mozart's *Don Giovanni*, with one of Palestrina's pieces, or with the Ambrosian or Gregorian chant, and if he does not find more consummate knowledge of the art, more mind, displayed in the conception and arrangement of the former than in the latter, though this may be written in the pure sublime style, we shall give up the case. We are even disposed to go further, and maintain, that it is more difficult to compose an opera of the higher class than an ordinary piece of sacred music,—a mass, or an anthem; from the circumstance that the passions and sentiments to be depicted, and the characters to be represented, being more diversified in the former than they can possibly be in the other, the composition requires, in order to obtain full success, a greater versatility of resources in the musician. The same remarks apply to the execution of both styles, for it must be more difficult to perform operatic music as it ought to be performed, in order that it may produce its due effects, than sacred music, independently of what relates to the histrionic power of the vocal performers.

It may, perhaps, be maintained, that sacred music demands in general a greater display of complicated and profound harmony, modulations, fugues, &c.; that the consequence of this is the production of grander effects, and that this circumstance, joined to the long study required before a musician can become properly versed in this difficult department of the science, places that style far above the others. But admitting the greater necessity of harmony in the sacred style than in the dramatic, considered in all its branches, we question whether learned harmo-

ny and intricate modulations are so far excluded from operatic compositions as to make this exclusion a cause of preference of the former style. Indeed, experience has shown that there are many situations in a serious opera which admit of, or even require, the aid of complicated and full harmony, a rich flow of modulation and an intimate acquaintance with the peculiar effects of various instruments. It is impossible to consult the works of Mozart, Weber, Mehul, and the later compositions of Rossini, without perceiving the use which may be made of these, and the powerful effects that have been obtained from them. If such be the case, it must necessarily result, that any argument in favour of the sacred style, founded on the aid which it derives from harmony, whatever weight it might have possessed formerly, has ceased to possess any. It would be more proper to say, that the harmony required in the sacred style is of a different character from that suited to the drama; that it is more grave, solemn, and gloomy, and presents some peculiarities of construction imparting to that style the particular colouring by which it is so readily recognized, rather than to maintain that the latter is preferable, and that its preference or greater cultivation indicates a higher state of art. If we admit the truth of the latter opinion, we shall necessarily be forced to admit also, that the art was in a more flourishing condition during the time of Ambrosius and Gregory, or even of the ancients from whom the chants which bear the names of those celebrated Popes were derived, as well as during the time of the early reformers, than it was during the last century in Germany, France and Italy, and among such individuals as Beethoven, Haydn, Gluck, Mozart, Paer, Mayerbeer, Weber, &c. &c.; that the same superior condition in the art is to be found in England, which of the countries of Europe is the only one that presents us with concerts exclusively appropriated to the performance of ancient music, and where sacred music was at one time cultivated with the greatest zeal. We must beg Dr. Crotch's pardon for not being able to admit all this, or to concede that either he, or any of his predecessors, whatever may be their veneration for the sacred and sublime styles, can at all be compared to either of the masters we have cited, or to a thousand others who have shone in the dramatic line of music in Germany, Italy and France.

If the sublime style be really a more exalted department of the art, it can only be so from the circumstance, that it is suited, from its gravity, solemnity, and gloominess, to objects of a more exalted nature. But viewed in itself,—having regard to its organization, to its intrinsic character, and to the degree of genius and talent required in the composers who devote themselves to it, we must repeat, that it is very doubtful whether it is superior to the dramatic style, and that we are disposed to deny

that a decline of taste for it indicates a decline in the art. If it be objected, that there are individuals who, though having succeeded in operatic composition, have failed in their attempts in the sacred style, we shall reply, that from this circumstance no argument can be drawn in favour of the greater difficulty and superiority of the latter; because it would not be difficult to discover, in the annals of the art, the names of many composers who have distinguished themselves in the sacred style;—who have produced music of a really sublime character; and who nevertheless were completely unfortunate in the dramatic line.

We maintain, then, that so far as concerns the musical world generally, the taste may have changed; that the style now most popular may be different from that which prevailed formerly; but that the art has not, as Dr. Crotch affirms, declined. If, however, we now examine how far the opinion of that writer is correct in relation to England, we shall perhaps come to different conclusions. On a former occasion we stated our views respecting the claims of the English to a rank among musical nations; and we have not since found any reason for changing or modifying the opinion we then expressed. It is but justice to them to state, that in the sacred style—in that “religious harmony which should be moving, but noble withal, grave, solemn and seraphic,” they have produced a few composers—Talis, Greene, Boyce, Purcell, Berwith, Novello—who have attained a certain degree of renown; and that they justly boast of some clever writers of glees, ballads, and other light pieces. But in dramatic music, as well as in the higher department of church compositions, they have failed so completely, that it would be impossible to discover among them more than one or two individuals who have attained a celebrity based upon really valuable productions, or extending beyond the limits of their own island. It is true, that their pretension to pre-eminence runs high; that they compare and even prefer their early dramatic composers to those who flourished in Italy at corresponding periods; that they continually revile French music and French composers, whom they consider as very far inferior to their own; that they refer the excellencies of some of the greatest German masters, Gluck for instance, to the example and advice of their own composers, or to the taste of the English public; that they laud Shield, Linley, Arnold, Storace, and Braham; compare Bishop to no less a character than Rossini; and maintain seriously, that “native music in England has now arrived to such a degree of perfection, as to enable the English to vie with the Italian stage.” But notwithstanding these flourishes, it will be found on examination, that with the exception perhaps of one single opera, now upwards of fifty years old, and which like every only child is petted by its parents,—the *Artaxerxes* of Dr. Arne—we do not find in the long catalogue

of English musical pieces, one which is entitled to praise; which is, strictly speaking, original, and possesses a rightful claim to the denomination of *opera*. It will be found that all the authors we have named are either copiers or compilers; that whenever they have attempted to modify, they have spoiled the music of the great masters; that whenever they have aimed at originality, their compositions have not attained to a higher rank than that of ballad or light cavatina pieces; that while the musical amateurs in England go to the continent to cultivate and improve their taste; while the managers of their theatres engage at a high price continental composers, or get up continental operas; no one visits England to hear English music; no English composer is ever heard of on the continent; and no English composition has ever been imported there. It will be found, also, that Bishop himself has not as yet produced a single dramatic piece deserving the name of opera, or which can entitle him to more than the reputation of a fourth rate composer; and that he has not proved he possesses power sufficient to combine more than a few musical ideas, or to give these the degree of development naturally to be expected from a great master in the dramatic line of composition. Nor is this all. Instrumental or chamber music is almost unheard of in England, there being no symphonies, overtures, quintetts, quartetts, or solo pieces for keyed or string instruments, of any degree of excellence, for which we are indebted to the composers of that country.

This assuredly is a very different state of the art from that presented in Germany, Italy, or even in France, the music of which is decried by the English, though it daily furnishes sacred, dramatic and instrumental pieces which are heard with delight from one end to the other of the European continent, and even in England itself.

With these facts before us, it is not in our power to contradict Dr. Crotch when he maintains that the art has been and continues on the decline in England. We shall differ probably from him, however, in respect to the circumstances which indicate that decline; for while he seeks for the cause in the greater fondness for the dramatic and chamber style, which at present prevails, we would point them out, in the absence of good English operatic or instrumental music, to compensate for the present dearth of composers of sacred pieces in that country.

Other writers, besides Dr. Crotch, have complained of the decline of the musical art, and have deplored the changes effected in particular departments of the latter. Earl Mount Edgcumbe, in a little volume of musical reminiscences, published a few years ago in London, is very decided in the opinion, that the style of dramatic composition at present in vogue

in Europe is very inferior to that which prevailed fifty years ago, and marks a decided deterioration in the art. That the style is materially changed during the course of that period; that an opera contains a smaller number of arias and a greater number of quartettos, quintettos, sestettos; that the finales in full chorusses are more frequently employed; that the accompaniments are fuller, the harmony richer, the orchestras more numerously filled, and at times more noisy, &c. are facts which must be familiar to every musical amateur. But whether the modern style is on these accounts inferior to the other—whether the change indicates a decline in the art—is matter of opinion, and it would require an authority more potent than that of the noble writer to whom we have alluded, to make us join in the sentiment he has expressed. No one, we presume, will feel disposed to deny that Cimarosa, Paesiello, Piccini, and many other dramatic composers of the latter half of the eighteenth century, evinced great genius, taste and expression, and produced a variety of most delicious compositions. But we believe, at the same time, that it would be impossible not to admit that the composers who have contributed most effectually to the revolution so much deplored by the Earl—Weber, Mayerbeer, Spohr, Bellini, Donizetti, not to speak of Mozart, who commenced it, and Rossini, who consolidated it—were also endowed with a goodly portion of those requisites, and may therefore be supposed to have placed the art on at least as respectable a footing as their predecessors had done. Considering, besides, that the resources of the art have greatly increased; that the effects of instruments and harmony are better appreciated; that the demand for strong and new emotions and striking effects has become more general; that the stock of new situations and ideas is nearly exhausted; and that the difficulty of producing compositions of merit, and capable of commanding success, must, in consequence, be prodigiously increased; it may readily be understood that the task of the composer is not the same as it was at the time of Paesiello, and that to attain the same eminence requires now more genius and acquirements. Judging from the difficulties against which modern composers have to contend, and from the effects they nevertheless produce, we cannot perceive in their works an indication of the decline so loudly contended for, and do not conceive how a condition of art, requiring talents so diversified, and scientific acquirements of so superior a nature, can be regarded as inferior to that which prevailed formerly. The taste of the amateurs of dramatic music has changed; but this, we repeat, cannot be admitted as proving the other point, for on the same principle the contemporaries of Peri, had they lived, might have deplored the difference of taste manifested by their successors of the eighteenth century, and main-

tained that, compared to its condition during the time of that composer, and of Cavalli, the art had declined.

While, however, deploring the decline of the art in England, Dr. Crotch solaces himself with the reflection, that the public taste is improving in that country, and that the art will, in consequence, mend also. He considers that the lowest decline of taste in England may be fixed at within thirty years of the close of the eighteenth century, when church music had become neglected, and oratorio composers were no more, the opera not arrived at perfection, and the concert *sinfonia*, if performed, not listened to; when playing on the harpsichord or piano-forte had become an indispensable part of polite education; and yet the fashionable composers for these instruments were Nicolai, Sterkel, Staes, Eichner and others, whose names are nearly forgotten.

“At this time the musical world of connoisseurs were divided into two opponent parties—the admirers of the ancient and modern styles; the one despising the trifling melodies of the opera, and the other the barbarous and mechanical structure of the fugue. The introduction of Boccherini’s quintetts, of Haydn’s quartetts, and Clementi’s sonatas, into our chambers, and particularly of Haydn’s *sinfonias* into our concerts, in all which beauty of melody and scientific harmony were apparent, stamped a value on modern music, which many of the admirers of the ancient school were disposed to acknowledge; but when Mozart became the universal favourite, the long desired reconciliation between these parties was easy. The lovers of the ancient madrigals, anthems, and chorusses, could not but appreciate the vocal full pieces in the operas of this great composer. Science could no longer be held in ridicule; if admired in one author, it must be equally so in another. That which Mozart praised and imitated could not be despised by his own devotees. Of Handel he always spoke with reverence: he adapted his music to German words, expressly that his countrymen might perform and value it; and this he often did without making any alteration, though at other times he consulted the taste of the hearers, and endeavoured to render it more palatable, by what they would call improvements.”

In England the contest was more protracted than on the continent. Salomon’s concerts were intended for the cultivation of modern music, and principally esteemed for the German *sinfonias*, which were ably performed there. On the other hand, the vocal concerts encouraged the performance of chorusses of the old school, and especially of English ancient madrigals and modern glees. Both these concerts failed eventually, without being able to claim the victory; for the two parties remained opposed to each other at a time when the admirers of ancient music on the continent had disappeared. “The attack was vigorous, the defence determined: the performances at Westminster Abbey and the concert of ancient music enabled the old school to hold out till the pacification already mentioned, effected by the introduction of Mozart’s music, took place.”

The causes of the improvement of taste which is taking

place in England are to be sought for, according to Dr. Crotch, in the following circumstances:

1st. Differences of opinion concerning the merits of the ancient and modern, of the German and Italian schools, and of various individual composers, are constantly diminishing.

2d. English concerts in general, "which seemed at one time to consult, rather than direct, the public taste," furnish not only every modern novelty, but frequently the choicest specimens of ancient lore, known formerly to the musical antiquarian alone, or only heard by the subscribers to the concert of ancient music. "The loss of Salomon's concerts was amply supplied by the establishment of the Philharmonic, directed (as all musical establishments ought to be), by musicians alone. Here we have the finest instrumental and vocal modern music. Here the admirers of the German and Italian schools meet, and learn to appreciate the opposite merits of the beautiful and ornamental styles, with a considerable, though inferior, portion of the sublime."

3d. The Royal Academy of Music professes to educate musicians on these principles. It employs masters in every style, Italian, German and English, for modern and ancient music; and if this be kept up equally in all its departments, it cannot fail to diffuse a refined taste throughout the world.

4th. The dilettante performers on the piano-forte make a more general use of music not expressly composed for that instrument, either when read immediately from the score or from a correct adaptation. The productions expressly intended for the piano-forte or the songs, with an accompaniment for that instrument alone, form but a very small part of the abundance of what is admirable in our art, and by resorting to scores or to adaptations, the musical taste of the performer will, by being reminded of what has delighted him in the church, oratorio, opera and concert, be greatly improved.

5th. Another cause of the improvement of the public taste is the reprinting of what may be called classical music, undertaken, as it has been in some instances, by the best musicians of the age. The publication of sinfonias, quartetts, and operas in full score, is a proof of the existence of good taste on the continent, as the importation, adaptation and study of them in England will be of the improving taste of the nation.

6th. Another cause is the improvement which has gradually manifested itself in compositions for the piano-forte—the natural consequence of the increasing admiration of full music. This improvement consists in a less attention to passages of execution and ornamental fascinations of melody alone, which were only calculated to give rapidity to the finger, and in a greater regard for harmony and science.

This assurance of a progressive improvement of taste in Eng-

land, must be gratifying to every lover of music, and to every friend of English pre-eminence. Confessedly it was time we should be made fully aware of the fact, and that we should be able to cite in support of it so excellent an authority as Dr. Crotch; for, strange as it may appear, there were till now many individuals who, notwithstanding the assurances daily received on the subject from English papers, periodical works, and other sources of information, obstinately refused to acknowledge the existence of any taste in England, or the possibility of its being created, unless some change were miraculously effected in the physical organization of the people; and there were not wanting Englishmen themselves who spoke as lightly as others have done of their older and modern dramatic composers, and feared not to declare that "every spark of the hopes of native composers is, for the present, smothered, if not extinct." Such doubts, and such opinions, however, can no longer, we presume, be entertained, and we may all now live in the hope of seeing the day when the church style will once more become pre-eminently popular,—when the old music will banish all modern compositions from the church and chamber,—when the ancient madrigal and modern glees will once more assume their sway,—when the trifling and insipid pieces, yclept Italian operas, will no longer be allowed to be performed, and when a national opera will be got up, which will eclipse in grandeur, beauty, and splendour, all the efforts of the art in foreign countries, and in listening to which John Bull will, to use the mellifluous phrase of Mde. D'Arblay, become *insensibly caught and unconsciously beguiled into ameliorated musical taste.*

However this may be, there remains one circumstance upon which we must pause, previous to leaving the subject of the present condition of the art in Europe. It appears to us that the state of taste in any country must be regarded as a tolerably sure indication of the condition of the art there; for taste, while it may govern the latter, is itself under its influence. Bad models will vitiate the taste—good models will create and perfect it. In England, therefore, where taste is proverbially of an inferior character, and where this inferiority is manifested not only by the kind of music most grateful to English ears, but by the vulgarity of manner natural to most of their singers, and which is loudly complained of by some of their better informed critics, we could hardly expect the art to be in a flourishing condition. Now Dr. Crotch speaks of the good taste existing on the continent of Europe; from which we may safely conclude, that the art is in a very different condition there from what it is observed to be in England; and yet the kind of music which he finds so objectionable, and to which he refers the decline of the art in his own country, is precisely the one for which a taste prevails in France, Italy, and Germany!!

We are not disposed to believe, from all we have heard or read, that the Ambrosian or Gregorian chants, or the psalms of the reformers—the old hundredth and the old thirty-eighth included—would meet with much success among the present generations of those countries. They would consign such pieces to the church and to the subscribers to the concert of ancient music, and with far better taste prefer modern turns of melody, and compositions superior to those of our predecessors in respect to mechanism, richness of details, simplicity and ensemble, combined with more or less harmony, which, as all know, is not the special attribute of the sublime style. It is plain, therefore, that the decline of the art, and the defective musical taste in England, must be attributed to other causes than those to which Dr. Crotch has alluded—the abandonment of the sublime, and the pre-eminence of the beautiful and ornamental. The inferiority of taste among the English may be referred in part to the imperfect nature of their models; while the decline of the art depends on many circumstances, though principally on the inferiority of their musical sense, and on the complete absence of a national school of music in that country. That such is the case, at least as relates to taste, may be inferred from the circumstance, that the higher classes of society, who travel much, and have heard good modern continental music abroad and at home, evince a marked superiority over the rest of their countrymen who are deprived of these advantages, and limited to the music of their own composers.

Dr. Crotch remarks, that the Italians are justly accused of having less expression and pathos than the Germans. This observation might perhaps be regarded as to a certain extent founded, if we judged of the two nations solely by the character of some of their church compositions. It is likely indeed that Dr. Crotch has contented himself with this source of comparison, for he is known to give a decided preference to that class of composition, and to hold it in the light of a touch-stone of excellence in a composer; and all the examples he cites, to prove the correctness of his opinion, are derived from sacred pieces. But we doubt whether the charge could be sustained on a comparative survey of the various classes of compositions for which we are indebted to the musicians of both nations.

The music of the Germans is of a more serious and sombre cast, more generally in the minor keys, less sprightly and light, and more charged with harmony than that of the Italians. From this circumstance, it is found more generally adapted to serious, and particularly to church compositions. Hence we find that German composers have, with few exceptions, succeeded much better in the serious than in the comic opera, and that the sacred style has been carried to a higher state of perfection in Germany than in any other country, and particularly in Italy, where the

lively feelings, the luxuriant and brilliant imagination of the people, have sometimes caused in their composers a departure from the rules of propriety, and led them to impart to their serious secular, and even to their sacred music, a character of cheerfulness totally unsuited to these styles, and detracting from the effects they are calculated to produce. The sombre and melancholy cast, the greater fondness for a display of harmony, and the absence of florid ornaments, impart to the music of the former, and even to their often meagre melody, an appearance of expression pleasing to many individuals, and frequently wanting in the compositions of the Italians. But from the circumstance of the greater fondness of the latter for sprightly music and florid ornaments, it does not follow that they are taxable with being invariably less distinguished for expression and pathos than the Germans. That such a charge cannot with justice be adduced against them, may be inferred from an examination of the secular and sacred music of their great masters.

Every one who, unlike Dr. Crotch, considers operatic music as entitled to some attention, knows that the compositions of Cimarosa, Paesello, Bellini, Rossini, not to cite those of many other dramatic composers, abound in passages remarkable for the delicacy and depth of their expression, and for their exquisite pathos. It is well known also that Leo, Palestrina, Pergolesi, Carissimi, Allegri, Steffani, Jomelli, among the older—and Cherubini, Zingarelli, Bertini, Luchesi, Minoja, Salieri, Ricci, among the modern writers for the church, have given evidence of an equal degree of those qualities. If, led astray, as we have admitted they often are, by the exuberance of their fancy, the Italians are occasionally negligent of the propriety of suiting the music to the situation, and even to the sense of the words, a reference to the compositions of German musicians will show that the latter are themselves sometimes guilty of the same defect. It may be worth while to state, that Dr. Crotch gives as an example of this defect in the Italians, a song by Haase. But Haase, though he wrote in the Italian style, was a German, and his faults ought certainly not to be shouldered on the Italians. Were Dr. Crotch to be credited, the error in question is universal among the composers of Italy, who “finding themselves unrivalled in the beautiful style, became enamoured of it; and considered it as alone sufficient to constitute perfection”—and who “accordingly threw aside the science which they themselves had invented, abhorring canons, fugues, and learned contrivance (on which they bestowed the term *scelerata*), avoiding all but the simplest discords, and even the minor key itself.” The well-informed amateur will certainly be amused at this piece of information.

The opinion is generally received, particularly among those who are but slightly alive to the charms of melody and harmony, that music owes all its power to the influence which the poetry with which it is generally combined, exercises over the passions and feelings. Others, however, have gone to the opposite extreme, and ascribed all to the influence which the music itself possesses. Dr. Crotch seems disposed to strike a middle course; for while he acknowledges that the art possesses considerable influence, he remarks that, in extolling its descriptive powers, many writers have exceeded the truth; making it capable of what it really cannot achieve. Praise due to the poetry alone has, he considers, thus been bestowed on the music.

"Let the poetry cease altogether, or be in an unknown tongue, and then see whether music can build the walls of a city, or civilize a savage race. Music has been called the language of nature; but it is a very imperfect language; it is all adjectives and no substantives. It may represent certain qualities in objects, or raise similar affections in the mind to what these objects raise, but it cannot delineate the objects themselves. It conveys no imagery; and cannot even discriminate very accurately between the affections it does command. It may speak of something serene, joyous, wild, tender, grave, melancholy, troubled, agitated or pathetic; but without poetry lends her aid, we remain ignorant of what that thing may be."

We believe that, generally speaking, Dr. Crotch has represented the power of music in its proper light; but that on some points he has not awarded to it a sufficient degree of influence. Poetry undoubtedly adds much to the effect which the latter exercises, by imparting a definite shape to the idea which the composer wishes to convey, and to the sensations he strives to excite; and that without its aid descriptive music necessarily remains vague and incapable of producing definite and specific effects. Yet no one endowed by nature with a suitable degree of musical feeling can be ignorant of the fact that music, by the force of its own powers, and unaided by poetry, is capable of arousing in the mind a train of ideas—of exciting a series of sensations—which, if not precisely similar to those intended even in descriptive music, at least partake of the same character. Were this not true, it would be impossible to account for the effects of instrumental music, remarkable instances of which abound in the history of the art. How often besides do we not find persons, who, when listening to an opera, take no notice, or even do not understand the poetry, and yet experience, to the fullest extent, the power of the art, and are affected very much like those who follow with scrupulous attention the sense of the words. The exact meaning of these may be lost; but another of a corresponding character will be awakened in the mind. Music, it is true, cannot, like painting, seize on a particular action, and represent with minuteness all its parts. Like

poetry, its power of imitation is very inferior to that of painting; but yet this power is incontestable; and we coincide with Dr. Crotch when he remarks, that without its aid, poetry is necessarily forced to waste many of her richest ideas in attempting to raise the affections, which, when united to it, she finds no difficulty in raising.

This very naturally leads us to inquire how far the principles of taste and expression in music itself may depend on imitation. As may perhaps be known to many of our readers, this subject has given rise to much controversy among musical philosophers;—some denying the dependance, except in a very slight degree and under particular and rare circumstances; while others incline to the opinion that those principles are founded exclusively on that basis. As may be inferred from the title of his work, Mr. Gardiner has declared in favour of the first of these opinions. With a zeal and industry entitled to the highest praise, he has noted the songs and sounds of birds, insects and animals; of bells, storms, &c. He shows that the musical sentences used in musical compositions are analogous to the preceding, as well as to the sounds of other objects of the animated or inanimate world; and, from that circumstance, he deduces a proof of the reality of the dependance in question. Not satisfied however with this, he endeavours to prove, in separate chapters, that in the common exercise of the voice, primitive tones and combinations of a truly musical character are elicited; that these tones and combinations, as those of grief, anger, fear, surprise, are the same in every country, in every rank of society, and in every grade of civilization; that these primitive tones, which nature has impressed upon us, and which we utter instinctively, are the rudiments of speech; that well constructed sentences, simply as regards the flow of the words, will, when measured by musical notes, have all the relative proportions of a strain of musical expression; that the beauty of language depends upon the musical disposition of its parts; that oratory—the language of the passions—differs from ordinary speech in the employment of a greater number of tones suited to the expressions of the feelings; in their more musical combination, united to a greater regard to rhythm, to quality and management of the tone of voice and harmonious arrangement of the sentences; and that the sounds produced by the cries of infants constitute musical combinations, and a fruitful source in giving hints to the composer and musician.

It is no doubt true, that the simple sounds, and the combination of these requisite in music for the passionate expressions, are analogous to those instinctive tones of the human voice to which we have just alluded; that oratory and common speech differ from each other and from music, in great measure, in the

degree of the expression and in the extent and continuance of the combinations; and that the sounds of animated beings, and even inanimate objects, are strictly musical, and may furnish hints to the composer. Nevertheless, we suspect that Mr. Gardiner has found cause and effect where nothing but coincidence of instinctive impulse can in truth be traced; and has laid too much stress on the necessity of imitation. Every passion, sentiment and feeling, requiring for its expression a certain combination of tones—a peculiar modulation and quality of notes—it must necessarily follow, that the composer who is led by the sense of the poetry before him, or by other circumstances, to express any of those passions, &c., experiences at the moment a modification of mind somewhat analogous to that of the individual labouring under them, and instinctively hits upon the combination of tones required for their expression. The same circumstance occurs in singers or instrumental performers, who, entering at once into the spirit of the musical idea before them, will instinctively (if they possess feeling and talent) give it the right mode of expression, and emphasize in the proper manner. Now, it may reasonably be doubted whether this can be strictly called imitation of what would be observed in the ordinary expression of those passions and sentiments. According to our conception, there is nothing but coincidence: coincidence in the sentiments and coincidence in the mode of expressing it. Whenever an orator in the course of a speech, whether prepared or not matters little, has a certain idea or sentiment to express, the proper mode of expressing it—the proper combination of sounds—the proper inflexion of the voice—presents themselves instinctively. Certainly there is here no imitation, for the orator did not stop to consider what he had to imitate—what sounds would be required to aid in the expression of his sentiment. There is nothing but an instinctive and natural impulse giving rise to the proper combination of tones—a simultaneous rising in the mind of the sentiment and of the proper mode of expressing or adding force to it. The same thing occurs in musical and poetical improvisation;—the thoughts and the musical combination necessary for their due expression rising simultaneously in the mind.

From a consideration of these circumstances, we are of opinion that Mr. Gardiner would have been nearer the truth had he merely said that the passionate expressions in music are analogous to those elicited and made use of in oratory and ordinary speech; that like these they are natural and instinctive, and differ from the latter in being more forcible—in being conveyed by more complicated combinations of tones, and in being more strictly subjected to the laws of rhythm. Music by itself, and independently of words, constitutes, as has been said, a

peculiar and universal language, conveying ideas which, though more vague and indefinite than those it conveys when aided by poetry, do not the less possess a particular character, enabling them to be recognized by a good and well trained ear, and which exercise a decided power over the passions of the mind. This power music may derive from the circumstance that its expressions are analogous to the instinctive tones of the human voice and other sounds in nature, and that, like these, they must arise spontaneously and without premeditation, whenever the affections to be expressed are raised in the mind. In consequence of this, the musician, whenever called upon in the course of his work to express particular sentiments and passions, will hit upon passionate expressions similar to those which are awakened in the ordinary circumstances of life, because these passions and sentiments are of the same nature, and require the same expressions. Were this not the case, the sentiments conveyed by the music would not be those intended to be expressed; they would not be recognized, and incongruity would result.

The songs of birds, the sounds elicited by animals, insects, &c., do not serve as objects of imitation so constantly as Mr. Gardiner seems to imagine. They are natural sounds or combinations, more or less agreeable to the ear, and will be repeated by the composer, because, being natural, they will present themselves to his mind, although he may not have heard them before; and because the notes in the diatonic or chromatic scales being limited in number, it is hardly possible that the former should not occur in the composition of a musical phrase, without any reference to the creatures—whether birds or animals—that have been endowed by the Creator with the power to produce them. “The earliest impressions (says an intelligent writer) made on children by music, are probably in a great proportion of cases received either from the warbling of nurses, or the services of the cathedral or conventicle; and it may fairly be asserted that the effect is not produced because what is heard is like any thing in heaven or earth. That in after-life there is some connexion between the sounds of music and the tones in which human beings and perhaps other animals express certain feelings, is also not to be denied; there is some community of source. But the community after all is only remote; and there is more danger of making too much of it than too little.” “Why the combinations or sequences of certain sounds should excite particular emotions in the hearer, is a question of the same kind as why certain arrangements of lips and eyes should produce beauty. It is much easier to ascertain the fact than the immediate cause. But in neither case does the effect seem to depend mainly, if at all, on imitation. There may possibly be instances

in which a reference to early associations in a certain degree affects the decision; but no reason is shown for believing that this is either the whole, or an important fraction of the cause."

These remarks have of course no bearing upon that kind of music which is purely and wholly imitative; or on passages occasionally occurring in the course of a piece, and in which the author endeavours to reproduce the sound of some particular object in nature. These imitations, which as we have seen are usually vague and incapable of much effect unless aided by poetry, are often, we know, resorted to even in modern times. But this circumstance is certainly no proof that the true principles of taste and expression depend on imitation, or, as Mr. Gardiner states, are derived from the sounds of the animated world; because the effects obtained from music of the highest order are not to be referred to such imitations; because the latter are rarely resorted to, except on particular occasions, by the great masters of the art; and finally, because music founded upon them belongs, with some few exceptions, to an inferior grade of composition. Nature must certainly to a certain extent be copied, and we have shown, that the natural combination of tones will be, often unconsciously, reproduced; but the copy, if copy there is, must not be servile. A mere copier of nature in music and the other arts can never produce any thing great—can never raise and enlarge the conception or warm the heart. We may make here the application to music of a remark of Sir Joshua Reynolds in reference to painting. "The wish of the genuine painter must be more extensive; instead of endeavouring to amuse mankind with the minute neatness of his imitation, he must endeavour to improve them by the grandeur of his ideas; instead of seeking praise by deceiving the superficial sense of the spectator, he must strive for fame by captivating the imagination." "It is not the eye, it is the mind, which the painter of genius desires to address; nor will he waste a moment upon those smaller objects, which only serve to catch the sense, to divide the attention, and to counteract his great design of speaking to the heart." With equal truth we may say, that it is not the ear, but the mind, which the musician of genius desires to address; that he will neglect those small objects of imitation which would only serve to prevent him from speaking to the heart; and that the poets, orators and rhetoricians of antiquity in "continually enforcing this position, that all the arts—and among them we must include music—receive their perfection from an ideal beauty, superior to what is to be found in individual nature," have afforded an additional evidence of the talent for observation and analysis for which many of them were so remarkably distinguished.

ART. V.—*Journal and Letters from France and Great Britain.* By EMMA WILLARD. Troy, N. Y. 1833.

Who would not rather get him gone
Beyond th' intolerable zone,
Or steer his passage thro' those seas
That burn in flames, or those that freeze,

than be placed in a situation between conscience and gallantry, in which a single step cannot be taken in obedience to the dictates of one, without jostling the sensitive person of the other. The quandary of honest Launcelot Gobbo, in the play, when his conscience and the fiend were disputing whether he should make his escape from the service of the Jew, as interest counselled, or continue faithful to it as in duty bound, was not half so uncomfortable and perplexing. A magnanimous mind can resist the impulse of mere selfishness without any very extraordinary effort; every pure and elevated feeling is then enlisted on the side of the internal monitor; but when temptation to act counter to the precepts of the latter comes under the guise of devotion to those who are committed to our protection and our love, who appeal to all the finest and most delicate sentiments of the soul whenever they call upon us for support, transgression loses so much of its apparent evil by losing all its grossness, it seems to wear so refined and sublimated an aspect, that it almost presents the form and semblance of virtue, and thus not only the difficulty of *doing* right is rendered extreme, but the power of *discerning* it is nearly taken away. Satan evinced his profound knowledge of human nature, by first exerting his seductive wiles upon that one of our parents who was "for softness form'd, and sweet attractive grace," and then making her the instrument of his nefarious designs upon the man. The serpent, with all his subtlety, could never have overcome the strength of the latter; it was the woman, and she alone, whose blandishments had potency to induce him to commit the deplorable act which "brought death into the world, and all our wo."

Our position at present is the one which we have so earnestly deprecated; and most vehemently do we lament it. Amadis de Gaul, Rolando, or Don Quixote himself, were not more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of chivalry, as far as the fair sex is concerned, than we affirm ourselves to be. We love them; we would pay them all homage and devotion; we would worship them as much as things mortal may be worshipped without infringing higher rights. To all that has been uttered

concerning them by birds of every age and clime, in their moments of finest phrenzy, we respond with heart-felt ardour. We would even coincide in the idea expressed by the French poet, that had the illustrious personage, our great progenitor, to whom we have alluded above, been left a single day without the companion who made Eden smile, he would certainly have prayed for an abridgment of the time allotted to wakefulness: in the words of the original—

Si durant un jour notre premier aïeul,
Plus riche d'une côte, avoit vécu tout seul,
Je doute, en sa demeure alors si fortunée,
S'il n'eût point prié Dieu d'abrégér la journée.

It is therefore a most unwelcome, a most repugnant task, to say aught which may be construed into a want of the chivalrous feeling on which we have plumed ourselves. But we must be firm; we must avoid the rock on which poor Adam split, taking warning by his example how perilous it is to contemplate female fascinations, when they come in conflict with duty. The functions of a reviewer are of high import and moment. Should we not discharge them in a manner authorizing us to utter the favourite exclamation about the execution of justice and the falling of the heavens, we should be infinitely more obnoxious to censure than our authoress, were her lucubrations a thousand-fold more amenable to criticism than they are; for, according to an oracle to which no one may demur, it is a much more venial sin "to tire our patience than mislead our sense." The critic who does the latter, because a lady is in the case, is culpable of as great a dereliction of duty as the accommodating father confessor, depicted by Boileau, who always tranquillizes the conscience of his fair penitent by justifying her failings, instead of making them a subject of reproof; so that

Pleine d'erreurs qu'elle croit légitimes,
Sa tranquille vertu conserve tous ses crimes.

It shall not be said that we have ever been guilty of producing a similar illusion; and therefore, kind reader, and you, most excellent lady, though not impeccable writer, we beg you to set down naught in malice, of what we may say, and to understand with what genuine regret we are compelled to express the opinion, that the "Journal and Letters" are calculated to reflect neither much light upon the world, nor much lustre upon their source.

Qualem commendes, etiam atque etiam aspice; ne mox,
Incutiant aliena tibi peccata pudorem,

is an admonition which a reviewer should ever bear in mind.

It may be regretted that some literary convention, in this age

of Conventions, could not be held, in which, amongst other matters which require to be adjusted, that of female authorship should be placed upon a meet and proper basis, so that critics might know how far they can go in relation to it, and no farther. It ought really to be decided whether, in the republic of letters, there is any distinction of sex; or rather, whether the constituted authorities of the republic should recognize any such distinction,—whether they be entitled to suspend the laws indispensable for its proper regulation and government; in consideration of the petticoat any more than of the coat. This injunction, at all events, might be issued—that no lady should be allowed to prefer her claims to become a member of it, in her capacity of female, any more than in days of old the warrior dame, who coveted the glory of the tournament, would have been permitted to enter the lists in feminine attire instead of being cased in armour of mail; or than Clorinda, or Joan of Arc, would have rushed to the mortal conflict in calico or silk, waving a bodkin or a spindle for a death-dealing weapon. The visor should be down, so that if the sex be discovered, it should be in consequence of the delicate proportions and graceful bearing of the gallant fair one—in other words, whenever a lady publishes a book, it should be anonymously at first, until the place due to its intrinsic merits has been assigned to it without fear or bias. If such had been the case in the present instance, what an advantage it would have been to our readers! They would then have been spared this apologetic preface, and we should have been able to plunge in *medias res* at once. It is the fault, therefore, of Mrs. Willard, if we have “tired their patience,” as her name makes so prominent a figure on both the back and the title-page of her volume—besides being introduced into various other portions of it, whenever occasion requires—as entirely to deprive the poor critic of all the bliss of ignorance in this respect, and force him to solicit indulgence for the performance of his irksome duty.

The motive assigned in her preface for the publication of the work, strikes us as somewhat singular, as well as amazingly philanthropic. It seems that the excellent lady was doubtful for a time whether she should favour the world with her observations abroad, until the month of January last, “when an affecting appeal was made to her, in behalf of female education in Greece,” upon which she no longer hesitated, “since a channel was then presented, through which she could turn her labours to account.” We must confess we do not see very clearly the connection of the book with the object stated. It is not quite as palpable to us as the sun at noon-tide, how the cause of female education in Greece is to be promoted by Mrs. Wil-

lard's Letters and Journal from France and Great Britain; but no matter, "the end sanctifies the means," saith the old proverb; and as she informs us that "from her earliest youth her mind has dwelt with mingled sorrow and indignation on the dégradation to which her sex are subjected in Mahometan lands," we may trust that she will speedily indite a "Voyage to the Moon," or some other relevant work, to improve the condition of the Turkish ladies, particularly those of the seraglio; and that then, as she should not "give up to party what was meant for mankind," she will send forth a volume either upon matters and things in general, or the constitution of her school at Troy, of which she speaks so much, whichever she may deem most important for the benefit of "all creation," to use a phrase of an illustrious major and politician of the present day. This preface, by the way, furnishes one of the strongest verifications of the remark, that "none but an author knows an author's cares," which we have ever encountered. One might suppose, from the tone of it, the solemnity with which the history of the cogitations of the authoress in reference to the publication by which this was prompted is detailed, the motives, the manner of its preparation, and the importance which is attached to the matter in every way, not forgetting female education in Greece, that the world had been upon the tiptoe of expectation, in a perfect fever of anxiety, with respect to it—that its anticipated appearance had completely absorbed the thoughts of every reading compound of flesh and blood. Such may have been the case, but, if it was, we were certainly sleeping at the time with honest Rip Van Winkle.

The chief fault which we are disposed to find with the volume, is, that it is much more lavish of information about the lady than the subject—not that the former is not replete with interest, even from her own showing; but we always like to discover in a work what its title promises. The traveller who stops at an inn, the sign of which induces him to believe that it will furnish entertainment for man and horse, would not experience the most agreeable of disappointments at finding that the chief entertainment to be obtained was from the conversation of mine host, however pleasant a fellow he might be. With a noble sirloin and a foaming flagon, his companionship might be most acceptable; otherwise, it would scarcely occasion a protracted sojourn. On closing the Journal and Letters, we certainly had not an over-burden of definite recollections with regard to any thing, except Mrs. Willard engaged in delightful conversations with this and that distinguished personage; Mrs. Willard saying all sorts of pretty things to La Fayette, and receiving from the excellent general in return every indication of admiration and affection; Mrs. Willard visiting schools, in all directions, to fit

herself more and more for the government of that all-important institution at Troy, the *ingens gloria Teucrorum*, of which she is the soul and head; Mrs. Willard, overpowered in every quarter with eulogiums on her works, styled "the champion of her sex," and delighting Sir James Mackintosh by her conversation in a party to such a degree, that, when secretly informed that she was an American lady, his astonishment got so completely the better of his discretion, as to cause him to exclaim, "loud enough to be heard by half the company, 'Why she is very well!'" Mrs. Willard's husband, "a rider of political storms on a small scale," from whom she acquired the principles of general politics, a knowledge which "the writing of history since has kept in play," and which she has "put into practice in the government of her little empire at home;" and a quantity of other attractive and valuable information of the sort, for which we must refer our readers to the volume itself. The bad taste of exhibiting, we might say, making a parade of her domestic sorrows, of which our authoress has been guilty, deserves decided reprehension. It is impossible to sympathise with affliction thus thrust before one's eyes. Whenever we behold a display of the kind, it always brings to our recollection the characteristic remark of Curran about Lord Byron, "that he wept for the press, and wiped his eyes with the public." Of course, we would not insinuate, on any account, a disbelief of the genuineness of the distress which fills one or two of the letters; but grief is the most delicate and shrinking of all feelings, and should never be obtruded upon indifferent persons. This is indeed casting pearls before swine.

We must also enter our vehement protest, in the name of the *Academie des Quarante*, and of the grammarians of Port Royal, against the attempts upon the French language made by Mrs. Willard. There is no positive sin in not being well acquainted with that tongue of tongues, whatever may be its inconvenience, but to misquote it and misspell it is, in the words of Dr. Johnson's ghost, to "disseminate falsehood without incurring favour, and risk the disgrace of detection without participating the advantage of success." There is scarcely a single French phrase immortalized in the volume before us, which does not treat the orthography, syntax and prosody of the language with perfect contempt, disregarding them as totally unworthy of notice. Nor is the English of the American lady altogether such as, with submission, we would especially recommend to the study of her pupils. Her phraseology occasionally shows that she fully coincides with old Horace in opinion that it is right to enrich one's *sermonem patrium* or *mother tongue*, as we entitle it, with new combinations, as for instance,

when her eye caught the first glimpse of land, she says, she "stood as if *transfixed* by an enchanter's wand," an operation which we do not recollect was ever performed before by that wonder-working instrument—indeed we have always supposed it was so potent, that a *touch* by it was quite sufficient for every purpose. Her style, generally wanting in purity and simplicity, at times is surfeited with affectation and pretension—loaded with words which were intended to "burn," but which unluckily only smoke, so that instead of illumining her thoughts they serve to dim them materially, and these do not "breathe" powerfully enough to dissipate the vapour. Some efforts at wit bear a melancholy aspect; take the following as a sample:

"The greater part of the boasted fountains of Versailles are on the plan of spouting monsters;—a disgusting perversion and turning upside down of nature, against which I feel conscience-bound to bear my testimony. There is a little of it already in our country; but by all the principles of good taste; by the lovely streams which dash from over hills; by the wild cataracts of our mountains, which foam and sparkle in the native 'joy of waves;' by the thunders of Niagara, and the quiet of our stomachs, 'let's have no more on't.'"

To understand the peculiar point and force of the concluding delicate adjuration, it should be stated that Mrs. Willard discovered that it was no uncommon thing whilst looking at the

"Spouting monsters" for a "sympathetic imitation to seize upon your stomach whilst they are cascading; which operation they perform at least once a year, for the pleasure of gaping multitudes, and possibly for their health too."

A similar disposition to find fault, one of the worst propensities of a traveller, is too often manifested in her volume.

It was in October, 1830, that Mrs. Willard reached Havre, after a passage of twenty-four days. In that respectable place she remained long enough to get some few preparatory ideas of the country in which she was to abide for a while, and then journeyed in a diligence to Paris, passing through Rouen, where she inspected the famous cathedral, which was very near putting a full stop to her earthly peregrinations, as her "mind was smitten by it with a feeling of sublimity, almost too intense for mortality." She succeeded, however, in escaping this danger, but soon afterwards encountered another, though not quite so serious a one, in consequence of the vehicle breaking down in the little town of Arqui. The women of the village having been the first and most active in offering assistance, furnished occasion for the remark, that "they seemed never to have heard that the place of their sex should always be like the violets under the grass," which, whilst it is not particularly redolent of gratitude, strikes us as not altogether inapplicable in other quarters, and brings to our mind an indistinct recollection

of some obsolete phrase about a moat and a beam. On arriving in Paris, she was greatly disappointed at the aspect of things, owing to her having made her *entrée* through the barrier of St. Dennis. Had it been by the barrier of Neuilly, her first impressions would have been widely different, passing then, as she would have done, through the Champs-Élysées, and by the Tuileries, the most magnificent part of the capital. As Paris derives so much benefit from the influx of strangers, it would really be worth the while of the government to make a law obliging all public conveyances to enter in that quarter—"the first blow," as a homely saying teaches, being "half the battle."

Mrs. Willard's residence in Paris occupied nearly six months, and certainly they were not misspent. We may have found a little fault with the fondness she manifests for making herself the most prominent figure in her picture, so as to interfere with other portions which should have been brought out in the strongest relief; and we may not be able to testify any very strong admiration for the general execution of her work; yet it is nothing more than justice to say, that her activity and industry are entitled to no weak eulogium, and that she seems to have been actuated by a much more laudable spirit than that of the generality of travellers. Her aspirations, views and pursuits, are of an elevated character—however decidedly, in the account she has given of them, she may have taken the unlucky step which leads *du sublime au ridicule*—and as such they should receive the tribute which is their due, and which we render with all alacrity.

Of the persons whom she particularly knew in Paris, general La Fayette is the one who principally occupies her thoughts and pen. She had known him in Troy; she had known him, we say, in Troy, when he visited the United States, and, soon after her arrival, she despatched a note to him, in order to renew the acquaintance, telling him in it, however, that "she knew that France trusted in his cares, that the eyes of the world were upon him, that he must now give himself to the public, and that those who felt the deepest interest for him, and for the cause of which he was the champion, would be the last to wish him, on their account, to neglect his high duties," which, of course, only inflamed the ardour of the venerable general to take so considerate a friend by the hand. When he did so, "his heart seemed to expand as to a confidential sister;" he inquired about his Trojan acquaintances, Priam, Hector—we beg pardon, we mean Mrs. Willard's family and school; talked freely about his own family, and entered into a minute account of politics. During her whole stay she received all that kindness from him and his excellent family which they love to bestow on every American, and which must prompt every one who has experienced it, if not

to repeat her extravagant expressions of affection and gratitude, certainly to cherish those sentiments in their fullest force. With regard to one member of it, however, it would be no difficult matter to respond to almost any hyperbole which her teeming imagination might create; we allude to Mademoiselle Mathilde La Fayette, now Madame—we do not recollect what. A sylph-like form, aerial step, exhilarating yet tempered vivacity, a face

Where, union rare, expression's lively force,
With beauty's softest magic holds discourse,

beaming with all the sweetness and purity of the soul, by which its features are animated, an intelligent, sprightly, cultivated mind, constitute an *ensemble* which might well extort the exclamation—"Surely, never lighted on this orb, which she scarcely seems to touch, a more delightful vision." But this is not the place for raptures.

Is not the following little anecdote, in which the general figures, a delectable, or what a Frenchman would call an *impayable* specimen of the self-complacency of our authoress?

"Last evening, I went with my son to Gen. La Fayette's soirée. Mr. Rives, who happened to be near the door of the first apartment of the suite which contained the general's company, joined us. The rooms were unusually full. We edged along, conversing together—expecting to find the general in the next room; when suddenly the countenance of the blessed patriot, full of benevolence, was beaming upon us. After answering his inquiries about my health, I told him I hoped he was not the worse for the dissipation of the last evening. 'Oh no,' said he, 'I am all the better for having spent the evening with you!' This he said, not emphasising the *you*, but in just such a way that it might mean, 'I am the better for having been amused last evening;'—and I told him I was happy that he had been entertained. It may look like vanity for me to tell you of these things; but it is not my pride alone, it is my deeply filial affection, my reverential love, that is gratified thus to meet a return, where I had so little reason to expect it."

It was at the French opera that they had spent the preceding evening, and as her account of what occurred there is a fair sample of her style, we transfer it to our pages.

"The two boxes next, and each side the king's, were for the evening taken by the La Fayette family. There are places in each for six persons, two in front, and three deep. The General, Mrs. S— of Baltimore, (a particular friend of Madame George La Fayette,) two of the General's grand-daughters, Col. C—, an officer of his household, and myself, filled the box to the left of the king's. Mrs. S— and myself were placed in the front seats, notwithstanding our entreaties that the general would take one of them; two of his grand-daughters had the two next, and the general was quite back, where it was impossible for any one below to see him.

"The first piece was an opera, '*Le Dieu et la Bayadère*.' In this I saw the performance of M^{lle} Taglioni, the first dancer in the world. Much of this French opera dancing is what it should not be; but of Taglioni, though I expected much, yet her performance perfectly astonished me; and I exclaimed in a *pas seul*, where she seemed divested of terrestrial gravity, and to fly, rather than dance, 'this is the sublime of dancing!'

"The scenery of the theatre—the splendour of the dresses and decorations—the crowds of actors, all capital in their parts—the perfection of instrumental music displayed by the grand orchestra, who were all so perfect in time, that it was as if one spirit played the numberless instruments—all this was admirable.

"After we had been in the theatre about half an hour, an officer entered the box, bowed very low, and presented the general a paper, containing a few lines, written, as I observed, in an elegant hand. He looked rather grave and perplexed for a moment, as he read the paper; then said—'the king has sent for me to come to him. I must go, but I will return.' I begged him not to return on my account, if it would incommode him; but he said he could not consent to lose all the pleasure of the evening. Before he returned, the first piece was over; and those of the La Fayette family, in the other box, came in the interval to greet us. Their countenances seemed a little shaded, and I thought they were uneasy that he had insisted on sitting so far back. Mrs. S— then took her place behind my chair, and all appeared determined that he should take the front seat, when he returned. Just as they had completed the arrangement, he came in, but he refused to go forward. Mrs. S— now refused to take the seat, as did the other ladies also, who were in the box with us. Just then the sweet Mathilde La Fayette came from the other box to speak to her grandfather. He told her to take the seat; and though she would not for the world have done an impolite thing by voluntarily taking the precedence of older ladies, yet she did not a moment dispute what she saw was her grandfather's will.

"Thus seated and arranged, we went through another dancing piece. It was the *ballet pantomime* of *Manon Lescaut*. The scenery and the dresses represented the court of Louis XV. The stiff bows and curtsies,—and hoops and trains, and elbow cuffs,—the frizzed and powdered heads, and enormous head-dresses—the silk-velvet, gold-trimmed, long-skirted coats, and silver embroidered white satin vests,—the little boys and girls dressed like their fathers and mothers, and curtsyng and bowing as stiffly,—the dancing of minuets—slow, and graceful, and formal,—it was all pleasing: and the representation was historically true.

"Gen. La Fayette was much amused. 'Why,' said he, 'this is exactly my time!' '*Voilà ce petit enfant!*' exclaimed Mathilde, as a little boy, a sprig of nobility, in a long embroidered coat, and flapped vest, with his hair queued and powdered, appeared upon the stage. Said the general, 'I was dressed *just so* when I was of that age! *Just so.*'

"That piece went off. But I observed that the eyes of the people were ever and anon turning towards our box;—and when at another interval, we rose from our seats, as every body did, suddenly there was a shout, '*Vive La Fayette! Vive La Fayette!*' It resounded again and again, and was echoed and re-echoed by the vaulted roof. In the enthusiasm of the moment, I exclaimed, 'you are discovered—you must advance!'—and I handed him over the seats, unconscious at the moment that I was making myself a part of the spectacle. He advanced, bowed thrice, and again retreated—but the cries continued. Then the people called out '*la Parisienne! la Parisienne!*' You know it is the celebrated national song of the last revolution.

"The curtain rose. Nourrit, an actor who in the former piece had the principal male part, came forward. He was dressed as a Parisian gentleman. His figure was bold, and he bore in his hand an ample standard, which he elevated, waving the tri-coloured flag. He had himself been one of the heroes of the three days. He sung the song in its true spirit, amidst repeated applauses. When he came to the part where it speaks of La Fayette, with his white hairs, the hero of both worlds, the air was rent

with a sudden shout. I looked at him, and met his eye. There was precisely the same expression as I marked when we sung to him in Troy; and again I shared the sublime emotions of his soul, and again they overpowered my own. My lips quivered, and irrepressible tears started to my eyes. When the song was over, the actor came and opened the door of the box, and in his enthusiasm embraced him. 'You sung charmingly,' said La Fayette. 'Ah general, you were here to hear me!' was the reply.

"When we descended to leave the theatre, the thronging multitude reminded me of the time, when crowds for a similar purpose assembled in America. The grand opera house is an immense building. In the lower part is a large room, supported by enormous pillars, and used as a vestibule. To this room the crowd had descended, and here they had arranged themselves on each side of a space, which they had left open for La Fayette, that they might see and bless him as he passed. There was that in this silent testimonial of their affection, more touching than the noisy acclaim of their shouts. There was something, too, remarkable in the well defined line which bounded the way left open. A dense crowd beyond—not even an intruding foot within the space which gratitude and veneration had marked. I can scarcely describe my own feelings. I was with him, whom from my infancy I had venerated as the best of men; whom for a long period of my life I had never hoped even to see in this world. Now I read with him his noble history, in the melting eyes of his ardent nation. And I saw that he was regarded as he is, the father of France—aye, and of America too. America! my own loved land! It was for her sake I was thus honoured, and it was for me to feel her share in the common emotion. My spirit seemed to dilate, and for a moment, self-personified as the genius of my country, I enjoyed to the full his triumph, who is at once her father, and her adopted son."

Major J. Downing would certainly affirm, and with truth, that this "beats all natur." We have heard of the man who was father of chemistry, and brother of the Earl of Cork, and thought it an uncommon species of relationship, but it must yield the palm of singularity to that of the man of two worlds.

Mrs. Willard discovered that the general possessed "a peculiar tact," of which she gives an example that might enliven with a smile, for a moment, the face of the old lachrymose philosopher himself. Mentioning a party, she says—

"I saw again the benignant face of La Fayette, and felt the kind paternal grasp of his hand, and heard his affectionate—'How do you do, my dear friend.' Once in the course of the evening he made his way through the crowd, and came to me. He asked me if I was going to Mrs. Rives' the next evening. I said I was. 'Then,' said he, 'I will see you there.' I preserve his words, because I think they often display, as in this instance, a peculiar tact.—He did not in direct terms flatter me by saying that my being at Mrs. R.'s would influence his going, yet, he gave me a chance, by his manner of expression, to flatter myself, if I chose to do so."

It was to La Fayette that our authoress was indebted for her presentation at court. The letter, describing that event, and the ball at the Palais-Royal, to which she was invited in consequence of having undergone the ceremony, is, perhaps, the most amusing in the volume, and ought therefore to be extracted *in extenso*.

"TO MRS. O. T——.

"Paris, Feb. 14th, 1831.

"DEAR MADAM:—As I have been presented at court, and attended a ball there, I hope I shall now be able to afford you some amusement in return for the many acts by which you have so often and so kindly contributed to my happiness; among which I would enumerate your late affectionate letter.

"Our good friend La Fayette, (who frequently speaks to me of you,) on my first arrival here, mentioned my being introduced to the queen; but as things have gone since, I neither expected, or particularly desired it. But at length, as the invitation rather sought me than I that, I determined to avail myself of the only opportunity I should ever have of seeing royalty at home.

"Last Wednesday evening was the time fixed for the presentation. On Tuesday evening at the general's soiree, he introduced to me Madame Z—, whom he desired I would take with me to the palace, and who I have since learned is of English extraction, but recently married to a Polish colonel. I had never seen her before, and could only judge of her by her person, which is strikingly fine. The young Polish Count Ladislas de Plater, whom I had before seen at the general's, helped us to make our little arrangements. Madame Z— and myself were to go in the same carriage, and it was settled that as she was farther from the palace than myself, she should take me up, which she accordingly did.

"The hour of presentation named was half past eight. We went a little before the time, but the ladies had several of them gone in before us. At the entrance, we gave our tippets to the servant of Madame Z—, our only attendant. We were struck with the surpassing elegance of the grand marble staircase. Its distance from the door might have been thirty or forty feet. Through this we passed, between ranks of the king's servants in livery, and the military guard, all of whom stood in solemn stillness, and nothing indicated our way except the open passage between the two ranks. This way we took, mounted the magnificent staircase, which after we ascend a few steps, divides, and then unites again.

"After reaching the top, we passed to a large apartment, the two ranks still indicating our way, till we came to a lesser room, where were two gentlemen sitting at tables with writing materials, and also a group of other gentlemen in court dresses, speaking in an under tone, as if in a church. The gentlemen at the tables inquired and wrote down our names and addresses, and told us that after passing one apartment more, we should reach the principal reception room; that the queen would enter on the left hand, and we had best have seats as near the head of the room, on that side, as we could.

"Following these directions, we entered first a smaller saloon, where all whom we found spoke in a whisper;—from thence to the grand drawing-room, brilliant with almost innumerable lights. This room I should judge to be at least eighty feet in length. On one side were eight large windows, and on the other, eight of mirror to correspond. The hangings of the room, and the covering of the furniture, were of rich crimson. The wainscoting was in part gilded. Between the windows of mirror were pilasters gilt, and having attached to them branches for candles.

"Elegant candelabras were at the ends of the room, and suspended from the ceiling were brilliant chandeliers. Their light fell upon the splendid dames who were now entering in small groups, and arranging themselves on each side the spacious saloon, and it was reflected back and almost equalled by the clear sparkling lustre of the diamond, the yellow light of the topaz; the purple radiance of the amethyst; or in the mild tints of

spring thrown from the emerald. It was reflected also in the rich hues of the velvets—in the bright sheen of the satins, or in milder beams from crapes often of white, embroidered in gold or silver.

"There were turbans and toques of glittering materials, and berris with elegant plumes, sometimes tinged with colours, and sometimes of snowy white. Many heads were decorated with *bandeaux* and fanciful *aigraffes* of rich jewelry; sometimes with the most exquisite imitations of flowers. The rose, the lily, the lilac, every blossom of the garden, whether deep and rich in its hue, or bright and delicate, was emulated here.

"Many of the gentlemen present added to the splendour of the scene by coats loaded with embroidery, and glittering with stars, or with other insignia of royalty or military honours.

"My companion and myself had arrived at the right moment; not so early as to suffer the embarrassment of being first, nor so late as to get an unfavourable place. The main saloon was in the same range as the room through which we last passed before entering it, and apparently with that from which the queen was to issue, as it communicated in the same manner with them both, through two doors on each end, situated near each of the four corners of the room.

"We had found seats nearly half way up the room. Here we were soon joined by Mrs. C—, an American lady, whose husband resides in Paris. Her dress was a lilac satin, with elegant blonde lace; a turban of silver lama, surmounted by a plume of the bird of Paradise; her jewelry composed of a mixture of the topaz and amethyst set in gold. Soon after came Mrs. Rives, in blue crape, with an elegant toque of white, surmounted by plumes of ostrich. Her jewelry was of diamond and pearl. Every thing she wears is minutely elegant, and I am sure the French ladies, *exigeant* as she says they are in dress, on such occasions, must have acknowledged that hers was perfectly well selected and worn.

"There soon came to join us, (for our position now became the central point for the American ladies,) Mrs. B—, of Providence, Mrs. H. P—, of Philadelphia, and Mrs. C—, of New York. The other American ladies who were expected did not appear.

"Soon there was a movement in the upper end of the room, and the queen! the queen! passed from lip to lip. She came forth elegantly but not gorgeously attired; in blue, with a berri of white, with four white plumes. Instead of taking her stand, as I expected, at the head of the room, and there receiving severally, the ladies presented, she suffered us to keep our places, and came to us. When she had arrived at our party, Mrs. Rives named to her the ladies one by one. She addressed some conversation to each. Her manner was perfectly courteous and lady-like. If she erred, I thought it was in rather seeming too much to court, than to command respect; but all on this occasion were pleased, and said after she passed, how affable! how gracious is the queen!

"When I was presented, she asked me how long since I left my country, and remarked that I might, if I chose, address her in English. I said I was charmed to find that I might speak in my native tongue, and be understood by her majesty. She said she did not speak it well, though she understood it. The king spoke it well; he was much attached to the Americans. I made her a complimentary reply;—she smiled, courtesied, and passed to the next. We had not space for any great flourish in our courtesies, but made them as respectfully as we might.

"Madame Z— informed me that the queen said to her, 'Ah, Madame, I recollect having signed your marriage contract.'

"The queen was followed by her two eldest daughters, and a lady of honour. She has a Roman nose, and an agreeable physiognomy; her eyes not so dull as her pictures sometimes represent them. But she is too thin,

and has an appearance, especially in France, where women are so late to grow old, of being considerably more advanced than she really is.

"The eldest of the princesses, Louise, is like her mother. Her figure is delicate, of a middling stature, and well proportioned; her nose Roman; her complexion light; her countenance spirited and agreeable. The princess Marie has dark hair and eyes, and is a little like her father; but perhaps more like her eldest brother. Her figure is also delicate and well formed. They were both dressed in white crape, with jewelry of pearl, and large bunches of the most beautiful natural flowers directly in front of the corsage.

"The princesses in their turn each addressed some conversation to the ladies introduced. It was of course rather common place, but it was done in the spirit of courtesy and politeness.

"After the young princesses had passed on, a second lady of honour who attended Mademoiselle D'Orleans, the king's sister, inquired our names, and mentioned them to her. She is apparently of about the same age as the queen, but not of an aspect equally agreeable. She accosted me very graciously, and in the course of a short conversation, remarked among other things, that the king had spent some time in America.

"Next came the Duc D'Orleans, the king's eldest son, preceded by a gentlemen who inquired my name, and as in the other instances, mentioned it to the branch of royalty who was next to address me. The Duc D'Orleans is a handsome young man, of a middling stature, or perhaps rather beneath, erect and graceful—his eyes and hair dark. Either his health was not good, or his mind was ill at ease. His language was more complimentary than that of any other of the family, but his manner had more of indifference. He said in the course of the dialogue, that he was extremely sorry I was going to leave Paris so soon, in a manner which would have done equally well for, I am extremely glad. Yet notwithstanding, I liked the general cast of his physiognomy better than that of any other of the family, except the queen's. I could excuse him for not liking to be taken round like a dancing bear at a show.

"After he had passed, I was again addressed with '*Votre nom Madame, s'il vous plait,*'* and *Madame Veelar* was named to the Duke of Nemours, the elect king of Holland. It is however said that Louis Phillipe will not consent to let him go.

"His little grace is about sixteen, rather small of his age, handsome as a fair, blue-eyed, flaxen-haired girl. He stood talking some little time with me, and seemed to wish that here the talk might end. I naturally love the young, and I think my manner put him at his ease. Madame Z— told me that he said to the gentlemen who accompanied him, that he did not want to go any farther, for he really did not know what more to say to the ladies. His tutor encouraged him to go on, but said, 'you cannot now speak to the next ladies, for I dare say they have heard what you said to me.' So his little dukeship passed the nearest ladies with merely a bow, and doubtless said the same things to those whom he next addressed, as to those he had last spoken with. The young dukes were in splendid military uniforms.

"The queen had gone through the whole length of the saloon, and as that through which we passed on entering had also been filled with ladies to be presented, she took the rounds as if the two rooms had been one. When she had passed out of the room, we sat down; but when she had received all the ladies in the adjoining apartment, and entered to pass up on the opposite side, we rose again, as it is a rule never to sit in the pres-

* Your name Madame, if you please.

ence of the king and queen. It is also a rule to present the face, but this rule was not at this time strictly observed.

"In this state of affairs, our other American ladies came up, having been, it seemed, belated. Mrs. Rives, who loves not this kind of display, was in trouble, and the ladies who found that the queen had gone by, and they not presented, stood, looking somewhat blank. At last Mrs. Rives took courage, and led the way to find a part of the room where the queen had not yet been, and happily succeeded.

"Soon after appeared Lady Granville, the English ambassadress, lately arrived, leading forward a party of English ladies, caught, it seems, in the same dilemma with our dilatory *Americaines*. She attempted the same manœuvre which Mrs. Rives had just successfully practised, but failed. The ladies, some of them, appeared disappointed and provoked; and, as I thought, their eyes glanced reproachfully at her. Lady Granville looked at them, looked again at the crowd around the queen, clasped her hands, and threw up her eyes with a pretty action of despair, and left them in the middle of the room to make their way as they liked, and joined a party on the side of the room opposite to our place. I marked her figure and appearance, the more particularly as she is the daughter of the celebrated duchess of Devonshire, the friend of Charles Fox. Her countenance is interesting, and her form good. I have tried to think of some of my female acquaintances that resembled her, but I have not seen in any part of the United States, a lady so old, and yet so young. She must be at least thirty-five, but her step, her movements, her air and dress, were such as would become a lively, spirited girl of twenty. She wore a robe of purple velvet, rather low in the neck, with a necklace of amethyst and gold. Her coiffure was a berri of peach blossom crape, surmounted with a superb plume, (I know not of what bird,) in which all the colours of the rainbow might be traced.

"Soon after the Queen had gone the rounds, she retired from the room, and the ladies soon followed her example. Among the first to go were Madame Z— and myself. We promenaded the long halls of the Palais-Royal with somewhat of a lighter step, republicans as we were, than that with which we had entered. Her servant met us at the foot of the stairs, with our tippets, and we soon had our carriage at the entrance. At ten o'clock I was at home, having been absent two hours. The king did not appear this evening, it was said on account of a slight indisposition.

"On the 11th, I received on returning from a visit to the gallery of the Louvre, an invitation from the Palace to a ball to be given on the 12th, or rather a notice from Madame la Marquise Dolomieu, that I was invited.

"My invitation was for half past eight, but Dr. N—, who is quite an oracle in these affairs, said I had better go at eight. I had sent to Madame Z— in the morning, to say that if she was going to the ball, I would take her up. She called to say to me, that, much to her disappointment, she had no invitation. The Doctor was still present, and said that as many of my acquaintances among the gentlemen would be there, if I had a good servant, I might perfectly well go alone—nothing was more customary. I knew I could command the attendance of the most accomplished servant I ever saw:—the very Talleyrand of domestics. He is an Italian, in the service of an English lady who has resided in Italy, but now boards with us, and is one of the most friendly and obliging persons in the world. So at eight o'clock, with Luici behind my carriage, I took my way to the Palais-Royal.

"How differently at different periods of our lives do similar events affect us. At fifteen I was all in a flutter at the thought of entering a village ball-room, with plenty of company; how could I then have believed that a time would come, when I should enter the court of France alone, pass

through long rooms, guarded by files of soldiers, officers, and other royal attendants—and all this without any particular emotion whatever. My general feelings were, that I should see a show which it would, perhaps, be a satisfaction to myself and my friends hereafter that I had seen, and I hoped it would be worth the trouble I had taken to see it.

“It was not until I had passed through the first ante-chamber, after ascending the stairs, that a gentleman of the court stepped forward to receive and examine my card of invitation. The dancers, early as it was, had already taken their places in the room adjoining. The moment I appeared at the door, Mr. C—, an American resident in Paris, stepped forward and took me to a part of the room where Mrs. C— had an excellent seat; but although it was not yet the hour for which the invitations were given, almost all the seats were filled. Mr. C— went to search for a place where Mrs. C— and myself could sit together. He found one under a window. It was a raised seat behind another, on which four other persons could sit. We took it, and soon after, to my great satisfaction, we were joined by Madame de Laysterie and her three charming daughters—Madame de Remusat and Mlles. Melanie and Octavie. Soon after several American ladies joined us.

“And now the affair of entrance well completed, I had leisure to look about me and mark the splendid scene. This was not the salon where the queen received us at the presentation. It was however long and large, and brilliantly lighted from large chandeliers and candelabras, and in a little time it was so filled, there was not much room for dancing. However, as the dancing commenced, the centre of the room was cleared. The music was exceedingly fine. The performers occupied a situation that accommodated the dancers of the next room; for several other large rooms—I think five or six—were also filled with company.

“It was the most splendid ball that has ever been given at the Palais-Royal, as it was to be the last of the season. The dresses were elegant. The fashions were not materially different from those at the ball recently given at the opera house, but they were newer and richer. The white plume, though it waved often among the dancers, did not quite so much predominate as there, and more rich jewelry was worn.

“The elegant and delicate artificial flowers of Paris I am never weary of admiring. The rose held here her natural place as the queen of flowers. The carnation, the lily, the pink, the chinaster, and bunches of small and delicate flowers were worn, either placed high at the top of the head, intermingled with the hair, or in elegant wreaths, depending low on one side and rising high on the other. Crowns of roses, with scarce a leaf, and worn quite as high behind as in front of the head, were frequent, and had a fine effect in the dance.

“Sometimes a bandeau of jewelry was worn around the hair in front, or perhaps encircling the comb. Sometimes in chains or strings, fancifully arranged about the head, sometimes depending upon the forehead or rising higher, and used to attach some part of the coiffure. Sometimes diamond, or its semblance, glittered over a fair brow as the kernel of a wheat-ear, and sometimes the pearl was elegantly wrought into the form of a rose with its buds and leaves.

“At length the queen appeared, and we all stood. Her dress was splendid; chiefly by the rich jewels, which she wore in profusion; they were diamonds, in double rows, encircling large emeralds. A necklace, thus formed, passed twice around her neck, and depended in front. On her head she wore a superb bandeau of the same, above which was a turban of silver lama, and the whole head-dress was surmounted by an elegant plume of the bird of paradise. Her daughters attended her as be-

fore; but as she passed along, speaking to some and bowing to others, the young princesses remained silent. The queen addressed me as she passed; said she 'hoped I was well this evening;' I thanked her profoundly, but I could not tell whether she recognized me. Her manner was as if she did, but it is probable she did not. The young princesses were somewhat more *en grand toilette* than at the presentation, but their dress was much the same. They were in plain white crape, but they were coiffed with flowers, wreathed, and rising somewhat above the head. The French ladies of the best taste avoid overloading. However, the princesses wore this evening bouquets of natural flowers, placed in front of the corsage, which were really enormous. Their sleeves were short, with long white kid gloves. Mademoiselle D'Orleans also made the rounds with the ladies of honour; among these I conversed with the La Marquise Dolomieu, from whom I had received my invitation. She was dressed in a robe of gold muslin, the ground work blue, with a toque of blue crape set off with an ostrich plume of blue.

"Mrs. Rives was also dressed in gold muslin, the ground-work white, perfectly exact and elegant in its fit and fashion. The gentlemen were directed in their invitations to wear court dresses, which are generally understood to be embroidered coats, or military uniforms; but there was here and there one *en bourgeois*, some were in black velvet, the dress of the institute. Many wore stars, and other insignia of nobility. The foreign ambassadors from different nations sometimes wore costumes which appeared to my eye passing strange. What heathen is that? said I, to a member of our diplomatic corps. Which? Why that large dark man with a turban, long flowing scarlet robes, and an enormous beard. That, said he, is the Persian ambassador. The uniform of the diplomatic corps is rich and elegant. There was a young Hungarian officer in a close blue military uniform, covered with gold and ornaments; his coat without skirts, but his crimson sash forming a kind of drapery; he was perfectly elegant in his figure and graceful in his movements; a complete Apollo.

"After witnessing the splendid dresses and fine dancing for some time, Mrs. L——, who had joined us, went with me into the other rooms. In a long and elegant picture gallery, the queen and mademoiselle D'Orleans were sitting, and the princesses and some other ladies of the court were dancing before them. Their dances differ very little from our cotillions; but I am told that they do not vary their figures, but dance the same from year to year; hence the beautiful uniformity in the movements of all the dancers. The princesses of France and other high dames, dancing in the presence of the queen, were not so overpowered with grace, and bending under the weight of it, as I have of late years, much to my annoyance, seen in the ladies of our own country. One had no difficulty here in deciding which was dancing and which was walking; yet there was no violent movements, but real unaffected grace combined with that animation which music naturally gives, especially to the young.

"In making this tour of the dancing apartments we passed through the room which contained the throne. It was made on the same plan of those I had formerly seen at the Tuileries, Luxembourg and Versailles, but less ornamented. There were the three raised steps, the throne covered with crimson velvet, and the candelabras each side; card tables were now in the corners of this apartment, where gentlemen were playing; but few were here, though the rooms on each side were crowded.

"At last we jostled our way back into the salon, where Madame de Laysterie had obligingly kept our seats. Here we found a ring of waltzers; perhaps there were a dozen couples whirling round and round, faster and faster, until at length they nearly flew; whenever one couple were tired

out and left the ring, there would be another waiting to take the place. At length the dancing ceased, and a murmur ran through the room, 'the king and queen are entering;' and we all stood as before. They were leading the way to the supper table. The supper was set out in the manner of dining tables; the principal room was the one in which the queen received the ladies the evening of the presentation. There were three tables running through this room, at one of which sat the king and queen. I had a seat in another room, where there were, I think, six tables, at each of which there were covers for about twelve persons. The furniture was white china, with a crown represented in gilding. The forks and large spoons were of silver. All the tea-spoons were of gold, as had been those which were passed about frequently in the evening, with ice-creams and other refreshments. We found within a napkin, nicely folded, each at our place, a small, slender roll of bread—the most delicate in appearance, as well as the most delicious in taste, of any I have ever seen or tasted. For supper we had first brought on a kind of thin soup. After we had finished this, the servants offered us meats of various kinds, some hot, some cold, all of a delicate appearance. There were *trouffles*, which Madame de Laysterie and her daughters ate with much apparent relish. They are esteemed here a great luxury, but I have not yet overcome my dislike of their black, unpromising appearance. Here was a dish which the French call *gelatine*; there were also small birds, delicately cooked. After the meats there was a profusion of *gateaux*, and several kinds of confitures and jellies, beautiful and delicious. There were also various fruits, elegantly arranged in porcelain dishes—apples, pears, oranges and grapes—and rich wines of many sorts. Several gentlemen had attended our party to the table, and politely stood to see that we were helped, before taking their own repast, an attention which the other gentlemen generally paid the ladies.

"It was about twelve when the supper was served. As soon as it was ended, Mr. C—, who had so politely met me at the door on my entrance, descended the stair-case with me, to see me to my carriage; and while he was yet inquiring for my servant, Luici appeared and said he would have the carriage at the door in a moment; and sure enough it was not two minutes before *la voiture de Madame Veclar!* was announced. Mr. C— said he never saw such a servant; and by what means he had up the carriage so soon, he could not divine. He had expected we should be obliged to wait at least half an hour.

"I asked Luici, when we got home, how he had managed to bring the carriage so quickly; he said he had it placed with those of the ambassadors in the court, and Mrs. B—, my English friend, learned from her maid some days after, how he contrived the matter. He went to place it there, appearing to think it a matter of course; but the king's servants challenged the proceeding, told him the court was reserved for the carriages of ambassadors. But, said Luici, madame is the sister of the American ambassador. 'Oh, well,' said they, 'that alters the case,' and then left the carriage standing in as good a position as the court afforded. I regretted that the crafty Italian had told the falsehood, notwithstanding it contributed to my convenience.

"I could have wished my dear Mrs. T. for your presence on these two evenings, for more reasons than one. I should have had the pleasure of seeing you; and one likes to see one's own country well represented.

"Dear Madam, adieu."

Through the general's instrumentality, also, she was enabled

to attend some of the sittings of the French Chamber of Deputies. What extraordinary legislative scenes do they often present! If there is a place in which the full force of the Swedish chancellor's remark with regard to the government of the world can be felt, it is certainly that in which they are held. We have never experienced a stronger inclination to laugh at the broadest farce, than a *séance* has excited; whilst, at the same time, it is difficult to help feeling almost disgusted at the total absence of dignity, and even decency, which is frequently remarkable in a debate of particular interest. The grand scramble, in the first place, to get into the *tribune*, made by those who are anxious to speak, is not a very imposing prelude to a discourse, nor do the various accompaniments with which the orator is ever and anon favoured, make harmony rivalling that of the spheres. In consequence of them, a speech which, if uninterrupted, would scarcely occupy more than half an hour, is protracted throughout a sitting—a dozen incidental speechlings having been made in the course of it, by some members taking objection to sentiments uttered by the orator, by others rebuking their cavillings, besides a quantum of “civil dudgeon,” in which no definite sounds can be distinguished.—Behold that successor of Tully in the rostrum, into which he has succeeded in getting by dint of resolution and activity of the most edifying description. He is a prominent member of the *côte gauche*, hating the ministry, and hated by them with all becoming cordiality. After begging, *secundum artem*,

A propitious ear for his poor thoughts,
However trivial, all that he conceives,

he wildly intimates that the gentlemen of the cabinet are the most consummate scoundrels on the face of the earth. “See the furies rise!” The universal hiss which followed the harangue of Satan in Pandæmonium, or the uproar ‘which frightened the reign of chaos and old night,’ could not have been more appalling than the explosion which forthwith bursts forth from the *centres*. “*C'est abominable! c'est infâme!*” vociferate some fifty voices simultaneously—“*très bien! très bien!*” shout back as many others from the opposition benches—“*silence! silence! taisez-vous donc!*” exclaim a corresponding number from the *côté droit*—members spring from their seats in all directions, and pour forth volleys of furious sound upon one another—a goodly portion vituperate the president for not maintaining order—he, poor dignitary, exercises his arm in ringing the little bell with which he is provided, until it falls exhausted by his side—the man standing behind his chair for the purpose of calling out silence, whenever a noise is made, exerts his lungs to

the utmost—but all in vain. The glorious chorus swells every instant into “a louder and yet louder strain,”

And tumult and confusion all embroil'd,
And discord with a thousand various mouths,

bid fair to produce some most disastrous consequences. At length, however, the storm begins to spend itself; the president obtains a hearing, and reproves the indecorous conduct of the assembly, who seem to acknowledge their fault by “marks of adhesion,” and eventually it dies away in fitful puffs. The orator, all this time, stands with folded arms in the tribune, waiting for the restoration of calm, having at first futilely appealed to the president, and endeavoured himself to scream down the uproar, to do which he would not be able even *illi si linguæ centum sint, oraque centum, ferrea vox*. He now resumes his discourse; but forgetting, in the impetuosity of his feelings, the scene which has just taken place, he soon fulmines something else which produces a repetition of it with redoubled violence; and thus he proceeds, getting through his speech by fits and starts, with such distracting concomitants, that it is next to impossible to understand it as a whole.

The tribune, we cannot help thinking, is a bad arrangement. It gives a theatrical air to the discussions, not in unison with the dignity of legislative proceedings, however well it may accord with the character of the French, and causes considerable confusion, whenever any general anxiety to speak prevails, by the constant rush towards it of the various candidates for the ear of the house. Nor do we admire the system of addressing the deputies, and not the chair, although Mrs. Willard lauds it as “favourable to eloquence,” on the ground that speaking thus directly to the former, excites a sympathy between them and the orator; an argument, the force of which, we must confess, we do not fully appreciate. It might easily be demonstrated, were it worth the while, that the plan adopted in the English and American legislatures is, to say the least, not a whit less “favourable to eloquence” than the other, and in every respect is preferable. We would only ask our authoress, whether more splendid flights have followed the utterance of “Messieurs” than of “Mr. Speaker?”

Among the deputies, she particularly distinguishes M. Barthe for his ability, “the applause of list’ning senates to command;” but as she intimates that her comprehension of spoken French is not altogether perfect, we are tempted to ascribe her preference to that circumstance. M. Barthe, though unquestionably not deficient in intellect, is yet, by no means, a resuscitation of the famous statue which was animated with fire from heaven, by that old thief Prometheus. In all the great requisites of

oratory, he is much inferior to several of his compeers; with Mauguin, Odillon Barrot, Dupin, Bignon, Thiers, Guizot, he cannot be mentioned in the same breath. If the Demosthenian standard of eloquence be the true one, the first is, beyond doubt, the orator, *par excellence*, of the chamber. He approximates to it, both in manner and matter, in no mean degree. Powerful declamation, impassioned appeals, energetic vituperation, are the grand ingredients of his harangues. Like the overwhelming Athenian, he seeks rather to sweep his auditors away in the torrent of feeling, than to waft them along the stream of persuasion or of reason—to excite them to cry out “let us march against Philip,” rather than to induce them to reflect whether this will be the most salutary course. He is unequal, however, and does not possess the influence which his talent should have acquired, on account of the disrepute attached to his private character. No confidence is placed in him whatever; he is covered with debts, is a great spendthrift, and, in the general opinion, would advocate any cause by which he would be enabled to relieve himself from his difficulties and gratify his expensive propensities. His radicalism, therefore, is attributed not to any patriotic conviction of the justness of the principles which he promulgates and supports with so much vehemence, but to selfish and mercenary views. *Odillon Barrot* is a speaker of a highly attractive order, belonging rather to the Cicero-nian school. Of captivating address, fluent elocution, felicitous diction, combined with considerable warmth and success in moving the passions, no one rises with a greater certainty of being listened to by a willing audience; but at times, the glistening with which he would dazzle their eyes is not that of gold. There is too often much more of the pomp and circumstance of word than of thought in what he says. He, also, is suspected of appertaining to that class of politicians, whose consciences compel them “to quit the losing for the winning side,” and does not, in consequence, possess all the weight which he otherwise might. *Dupin* is unrivalled as a debater. “Profoundly skilled in analytic,” he overcomes all antagonists when cogency of reasoning and subtlety of logic are required. His powers of sarcasm are most uncomfortable for those against whom he is tempted to employ them, and if he ever fails to prostrate by the force of argument, he always contrives to disconcert with a *bon mot*. For the physical qualifications of an orator, he has no very strong cause to feel grateful to the generosity of dame nature, his appearance being unprepossessing, and his manner any thing but winning. As he is now the president of the chamber, he will have full employment for all his resoluteness and energy, in maintaining order. *Bignon*

does not speak frequently, but when he does, all that he utters is well worth recollecting. In some respects, he might be entitled the Burke of the assembly. With a mind of an elevated philosophical cast, enriched with stores of erudition, he prepares himself with elaborate care, explores his subject in all its ramifications, and sheds over it a broad and steady illumination, emanating from combined knowledge and wisdom. His speeches, when published, are especially entitled to studious perusal, though, perhaps, objections may be made to them on the ground of too much generalization and diffuseness. *Thiers* is the personification of the French term *esprit*. Fluent, ready, adroit, a happy rhetorician, he is always scintillating without ever being effulgent. He is often superficial, and at times involves himself in embarrassing situations—from which, however, he generally contrives to extricate himself with admirable address—owing to his indolence, which prevents him from informing himself adequately about the subjects under debate. It is related of him, that he will frequently neglect to pay any attention to the matter which is to be discussed, until half an hour or so before the meeting of the chamber, when he will call upon one of the principal clerks of his bureau for information, with which, slight and unsatisfactory as it must be, he contents himself, trusting to his “mother-wit,” for the accomplishment of his task. Fox, as is well known, was even still more remiss, often going to the House without an idea as to what he was to say, and there gleaning from conversation with the members, or the speeches of those who preceded him, materials which served, as an apology at least, for the splendid declamations which he poured forth; but he was an extraordinary being, and besides, his were the functions of an opposition leader, which, placing him upon the offensive, allowed him to choose his own ground. Crimination and assault do not imperiously exact knowledge of a minute description. But the case is widely different with a minister, whose business being mainly defence, renders it indispensable for him to be armed at all points, so as to be able to repel aggression wherever made. This defect in the character of Mr. Thiers must operate seriously to the detriment of his prospects, and is not likely, it may be feared, to be cured by the circumstance of his recent marriage with a lady of ample fortune, by which one potent stimulus to exertion is removed. With industry, he might play a very prominent part in the grand drama of politics which is enacting in France, for his is a genius peculiarly French. *Guizot* is a man of sterling ability, great learning, and, we believe, unsuspected integrity of motive, but not remarkably endowed with the attributes of a popular speaker. He must always be of great utility

and importance, though not, perhaps, calculated for the highest station, "tel qui brille au second, s'éclipse au premier."

Of the multifarious and unrivalled attractions of the French capital, the Journal and Letters furnish very slender details. Little insight is given into society; a few *soirées* are mentioned, which Mrs. Willard favoured with her presence, but of most of them the company was principally composed of Americans; besides one which she gave herself, where some of her acquaintances, among teachers, who "were people of standing," were present; others of the class whom she knew, and wished to invite, she did not, as she "found that the customs would be against it, and she might be placing herself and them in unpleasant situations to urge it." Humph! We are glad to possess the information which is here communicated; should we ever have occasion to meddle with the issuing of notes for a party in Paris, it will be of value.

Another circumstance connected with this *soirée* of Mrs. Willard deserves record in the words of the text:

"One point on which I was tenacious, was not so easily conceded. It was considered indispensable that there should be conveniences for the young folks to dance; but I maintained that this ought not to be in the principal salon. I could not consent that elderly and respectable people, public characters, especially such a man as La Fayette, should be crowded up in a corner, to leave the centre for dancing; an occupation which, though, when properly conducted, I do not censure in the young, yet certainly not entitled to any particular respect. It was in vain plead that it was customary, and that the general would be amused by it: I was so positive that I was right, that I was inflexible. If General La Fayette, and other elderly persons who did not dance, chose to go where they would be crowded, for the sake of being thus amused, then it was their affair;—if we obliged them to it, it was ours."

This exhibits a considerateness and regard for age, which we are so solemnly enjoined to reverence, truly edifying and praise-worthy. We hope that by the time we become a "verdant antique," the example she has set will have operated a salutary change in the social arrangements of the United States, so that whilst the "elderly and respectable people" enjoy their tea and cake and conversation at ease in the parlours, without being annoyed by the squeezing and jostling of tripping juvenility, the latter may be accommodated with the breakfast-room, or some other equally capacious apartment, in which a fourth part of them may probably obtain ingress, for the exercise of their light fantastic toes. The idea is glorious, and perfectly original; for the present, however, we feel no invincible objection to allowing matters to remain as they are; we guess, according to our patriotic habit, that the good people of the establishment where our considerate authoress boarded, and whose rooms she

used for the occasion, must have thought her something of what they would call an *originale*.

Mrs. Willard does not seem to have been very fortunate in encountering the distinguished personages who are figuring with so much *éclat* in Paris; judging, at least, from her almost total silence about them. The most interesting acquaintance whom she made, was Mrs. Opie, of whom she says—

“She attracts your notice first among a crowd, from her Quaker costume, worn, however, with something of a modish air; she uses also the Quaker *thee* and *thou*; yet with her fine flow of thought, and occasionally ornamented style of expression, it can hardly be called the plain language; the other sex seem charmed with her conversation; one is reminded by this of Swift's compliment to Stella.”

In reference to another lady, Madame Belloc, the writer of some excellent articles on moral subjects in the *Révue Encyclopédique*, she indulges in some very pretty ecstasies, with which we should be quite willing to sympathize, if they did not wear so palpable an appearance of being intended to rebound upon herself. No better plan of placing oneself in an advantageous light can be devised, than the eulogy of a friend, if dexterously managed so as to avoid all suspicion of personal allusion; but when you inform us that such a person is an amalgamation of every thing which can exalt, and purify, and sublimiate human nature, and that this paragon, on the second occasion of your writing, was “ready to take you to her very heart of hearts,” and that there was “a deep fountain of sympathy” in your souls, the inference is too obvious that you would feel no repugnance to an application of the old saying about “birds of the same feather” to the intimacy thus communicated.

The few observations which Mrs. Willard makes upon the society of Paris, are for the purpose of proving that it is a dangerous resort for young American ladies. Her reprobation falls, in the first place, upon “low-necked dresses, and such dances as the waltz and gallopade,” which makes us think that when she speaks of American maidens, the fair damsels of Troy monopolize her thoughts; for, alas! had she frequented the fashionable circles of our larger cities, she would have beheld those abominations staring her in the face as unblushingly as in the French metropolis; thus worthy Tityrus thought that Rome was like Mantua. What further weakens this objection, or rather turns it in favour of Parisian society, is her admission, that “these dances may do for girls who are guarded as the French females are before marriage,” so that our young ladies are in much greater danger here, where they are under infinitely less restraint, now that those dances are in vogue; and they had better, consequently, as far as this point is concerned, be despatched to Paris, to remain until it is meet for them to enter into the holy

state of wedlock. We do not wish to put ourselves forward as the advocates of the waltz and the gallopade, but we cannot help thinking that they are much more sinned against than sinning. The exercise is too rapid to admit of thinking of any matter whilst the dance continues but maintaining one's feet and catching one's breath, and is too violent to allow any feeling afterwards, save that of utter exhaustion from fatigue. As to the "low-necked dresses," we surrender them to the anathema of our authoress with perfect willingness;—they deserve no quarter whatever.

But Mrs. Willard's grand objection to Parisian society, is its want of a proper regard for morality. Though we may feel inclined to smile at one of the causes she assigns for her belief in the justness of the charge—that "once, in a room where few persons were present, she saw, by a sudden turn, a lady of whom she never heard ill, touch her lips to the neck of a gentleman, as he stooped for some object beside her,"—it cannot be altogether denied. We really think, however, that the ideas generally entertained on that head, in our country, are greatly exaggerated. There may be vice, but it does not exhibit itself; our authoress acknowledges that "nothing can be more modest than the demeanour in society of all she met," and as long as external propriety is preserved, there can be no risk for those who are not disposed to seek occasions for sin. As to her complaint of never hearing "characters scanned in Paris as in America, as to the moral tendency of their actions," we do not know exactly whether to be amused or angry with it. The fondness of ladies for "scanning characters" is an old joke against them, and if we change the final syllable of the first word of the quoted phrase into *dal*, we shall have the invariable result of the operation; but what business have people, either here or in Paris, to scan the characters of others whose conduct, apparently, violates none of the rules of decorum? We would reverse the complaint, and lament that we do not imitate the Parisians in not meddling with the concerns of others, when we have no right or warrant for the interference. As long as no evil is inflicted upon the well-being of society by the visible conduct of our neighbours, we hold that its interests are best consulted by a universal regard to the venerable injunction, "mind your own business." If the "moral tendency of the actions" of every one, is to be made the subject of reciprocal investigation, the millenium of dowagers is certainly at hand; but preserve us from ever becoming the theme of a knot of them firmly seated around a tea-table on a Sunday evening!

Whatever may have been the fact at a former period, we do not believe that, at present, a lady of disreputable character would be permitted to appear at the French court; and we do

not doubt that, under proper guidance, a young lady might frequent the society of Paris with as much safety as that of any city of the globe. We say under proper guidance, for, of course, in so varied and extensive an assemblage, no matter what might be its general excellence, circumspection and caution are indispensable. The freedom which is enjoyed in this country by the youthful portion of the sex, is only compatible with the smallness and compactness of our circles, where every one is, as it were, a guard upon every one. Whenever fashionable intercourse here swells to the dimensions it possesses in the principal cities of Europe, that freedom must inevitably be abridged, and a system adopted with regard to young ladies similar to the one which is there pursued.

Would that we could model our society in some other respects upon that of Paris! that we could imitate the ease, the courtesy, the refinement, the disposition to please and to be pleased, the spirit of mutual concession, the faculty of extracting amusement from every thing and any thing, which never allow you there to ejaculate with the poet, in a fit of despondency and *ennui*,

Business is labour, and man's weakness such,
Pleasure is labour too, and tires as much;

but which, on the contrary, render pleasure that perfect relaxation so conducive afterwards to a cheerful and adequate attention to business. The French have unquestionably carried society to as high a degree of perfection as it can well be brought. Their talent, in this respect, almost strikes a stranger with wonder. A stupid party—a phrase, alas! which is as natural in an American mouth as freedom, liberty and independence—is a thing which they could scarcely be made to comprehend. Let any number of them congregate together, and megrim takes to flight with as much precipitation as the owl from the garish light of day. Every one contributes his or her quota to the general stock of amusement; a sombre visage is a mark of rudeness and ill-breeding; and on separating, all are disposed to repeat the exclamation of Moore's enraptured lover, "how swift the hours fly." He that is pleased himself must always others please, is an observation of Shakspeare, which is no where so abundantly confirmed as in a Parisian *réunion*. Mere amusement, however, is not all that a stranger obtains by "going out" in Paris. The manner in which men of the greatest distinction in every way, in politics, in science, in literature, in art, mix in society there, furnishes him with ample opportunity of gratifying a laudable curiosity, and blending instruction with pleasure. Wherever he goes he may be always sure of encountering some one whom he must feel a desire to see, and whose ac-

quaintance he will find no difficulty in making. Their rational politeness and affability are sufficient to embolden him to trouble them for a while with his insignificance, and thus acquire a source of agreeable recollection—in all probability, of material advantage. This circumstance of the constant communion of such men with society, imparts to it, in a certain degree, an atmosphere of intellectuality which relieves and vivifies, if we may so speak, its unavoidable frivolousness, and may be said to act as an antidote to the bane of dissipation. In our country, unfortunately, men of eminence are so little addicted to frequenting the scenes of fashionable enjoyment, or when they do appear in them, it is with so slight a desire to take the prominent parts which they should perform, that society has fallen entirely into the hands of the young, and presents that aspect on which foreigners have so often remarked, of being little better than a boys' and girls' romp, where aught that is intellectual is sadly out of place. This is the reason, indeed, which the older and wiser portion sometimes assign for keeping in the back ground; but it is their own fault if it exists. Had they not resigned their proper stations at first, they would never have had cause to complain that society is totally destitute of attractions in their eyes; and should they now resume and exert their rights, a beneficial alteration must speedily ensue. Some standard of social distinction, of a more elevated order than spruce attire and proficiency in dancing, would then be introduced; young ladies would learn to appreciate other qualifications as more attractive and distinguished, and young gentlemen would feel a nobler ambition in relation to society than they can possibly do now, when mental cultivation and superiority are "of no mark nor likelihood" whatever.

There are two other points in which it would be for the advantage of our society if the Parisian practice were followed. The first is that entertainment with the good things of this life, which seems to constitute in our minds the most important appurtenance of a *party* of every description. Eating is a never-ending, still-beginning affair, on such occasions; your guests, like a ship before the wind, must constantly be "kept full;" and as this entails considerable expense, it may furnish one explanation why those really sociable meetings, which make so delightful a source of relaxation in Paris, are of such rarity here. The necessity, as it is deemed, of providing an abundance of amusement for the palate, no matter how small the assemblage, operates to prevent that keeping of open-house, which is so conducive to familiarity and good feeling, and imparts an air of pretension and formality, productive of a chilling effect upon "the genial current" of one's spirits. In Paris, a glass of lemonade, or orgeat and water, together with a little cake, if that, is all the

provision which is made for your physical man, at a common *soirée*, and more would only annoy you by interrupting the course of amusement; but here, you can scarcely open your mouth unless to swallow a cup of coffee, an ice, a jelly, chicken sallad, pickled oysters, or some other ethereal comestible, following each other in such rapid succession, that little else can be accomplished, than to do justice to them like every body else. Then for a visitation, after you have retired to your couch; from that agreeable companion, the night-mare, or, the next day, from the pleasant sensations which dyspepsia occasions. The other point is the answering of invitations for an evening party—unless it be a sitting supper, where it is requisite to know what number is to be present, which is never done abroad, and is an inconvenience to the invited, and of no moment to the inviter. The latter may be always sure of a quorum, whilst the former, in many instances, may not be able to tell whether it will be in their power or not to appear, and, acting upon this uncertainty, often send a refusal, when eventually they find that they might go. Besides, unnecessary trouble is given to servants in taking the answers, a useless consumption of their time is caused, and for one circulating generally in “the world,” writing so many notes is not the most fascinating mode of employing leisure moments.

As always happens, when we imitate others, whilst we have neglected those customs of European society which it would be beneficial for us to pursue, we have adopted one which we have no business with whatever—we allude to the habit of going at a late hour to a party. In Europe, where the whole arrangement of life is different, where, in particular, the dinner hour is six or seven o'clock, this is unavoidable, and in keeping with every thing else; but in this country, where, at four o'clock, for the most part, the cloth is removed from the table, what can be more nonsensical than delaying to repair to a ball until ten? It is quite as dark in winter at seven as at any period of the night, and there is no reason why as much pleasure cannot be enjoyed then as afterwards. Were it fixed upon as the time for assembling, many a stupid moment, we doubt not, would be escaped by those who are waiting impatiently and idly for the hour when they may depart for the festive scene, without endangering their *ton*, and many a rose would continue to bloom in cheeks from which they have disappeared under the blighting influence of vigils protracted long beyond the stroke of the midnight bell. But, *revenons à nos moutons*.

In reference to several matters appertaining to the female part of the creation in Paris, Mrs. Willard makes some just and sensible observations, which we transcribe for the edification of her sex in this country, whose interests she has so much at heart.

"We may make many valuable improvements from the instruction of French women in regard to dress, which, after all, is no unimportant affair to a woman. They certainly observe economy in some things, beyond the women of our country. Their nice things are not put on in the morning, or worn in patrolling the streets. They regard a *grande toilette* in the morning as decidedly vulgar; at the same time I must exonerate them from the charge, as far as I have had opportunity to observe, of wanting neatness.

"A plain dress of calico, or of some cheap material, made close,—a kerchief of plain jaconet muslin or *tulle* (cotton lace), finished at the neck with ruffles exquisitely quilled or plaited, and a cap of tulle, completes the morning costume of a French lady. The queen of France would not be so ungenteel as to wear a cap of blonde, or the princesses, her daughters, to wear dresses very low in the neck, or of slight material, before dinner, which here is ordinarily at six o'clock.

"In the care taken of their dresses, the French ladies observe economy. I have learned many useful things in the manner of folding dresses to lay away, and packing them to travel. If a good dress was to be laid on a closet shelf for only a day, it would be folded with the utmost nicety, and pinned in a large napkin. It then comes out unwrinkled, and apparently fresh.

"The use of large napkins at the dinner-table, is another way by which they display care in this particular. The practice, too, of covering the chairs and sofas of salons with covers of brown linen, which are kept clean by frequent changing, has no doubt its origin in the same spirit of nicety, though it saves the elegant cushions of the chairs also, which are often of beautiful figured material, of some delicate colour.

"More regard is paid to convenience and health in morning costumes in France, than with us in America. It being now winter, their morning dresses are generally made with linings throughout, and frequently with a slight wadding inserted. Ladies here never walk the streets with thin shoes, unless they have a pair of clogs over them.

"In what I have said of the neatness of the French ladies, I judge more particularly from those I have lived with. Madame B—, and her two daughters, are models in this respect. Their bed-rooms are as neat as their persons. In most of the French families where I am in the habit of making morning visits, I find the ladies in neat and becoming, though simple attire; but I see some opposite examples.

"The ladies, as they walk the streets, sometimes make a sorry figure. The trimmings of their hats, from the humidity of the climate, are apt to get a stringy, crest-fallen look. A kind of cloak is now quite in vogue, and worn by the most respectable ladies, made of a sort of woollen cloth, which looks like a thin inner blanket of a New England housewife—dyed in the yarn, and woven like kerseymere—presenting checks of about an inch square, of different colours. Some of these cloaks have these checks alternately of deep and pale blue; some of deep and pale red; and though a Parisian lady wears such a cloak to church, and in the streets, I am sure a New-England woman would not, on account of its vulgar appearance.

"What I have said of their dress for the streets, is to be understood mainly of their shopping excursions, which take them through narrow and muddy walks. All make these when they have real business. The newspapers, which give an account of all the out-door proceedings of the king's family, frequently say, that at such an hour Madame Adelaide, the king's sister, and his two oldest daughters, went out to make purchases.

"I never knew a French woman guilty of making a shop-keeper show her things merely for her own diversion. When the ladies go out for morning visits, for a promenade in the garden of the Tuileries, or take the

fashionable drive two or three miles west of Paris in the *bois de Boulogne*, they dress with care, yet suitably to the occasion.

"Although I did not intend when I came to Paris to change much the fashion of my dresses, yet as I find real improvements, I am pleased to adopt them, for the sake of utility and health, and besides, I find myself in a manner obliged, in the circle in which I am, to conform in a degree to the modes here.

"Yet though I endeavour so far to conform to the customs as not to disgrace my acquaintances, still in some things I will have my own ways. If I happen to hit upon something a little new, which takes, they give me more credit for it than if I had written a good book; but if it does not, then I have trials. You know I would never have my ears bored. Of course I do not wear ear-rings, and it really requires no small independence of character to get along with it. On a subject of such importance as this, even French politeness sometimes fails. The ladies seem to speak of it as if it were a kind of deformity; and one advised me to fasten ear-rings by strings passing over my ears. Sometimes, when I am asked the reason of my singularity in this respect, I say, (speaking according to the rule for answering questions given in the book of Proverbs,) that I always fancied I had an uncommonly well-shaped ear, and could not bear to spoil it. If I had had a homely one, I should not have minded making a hole in it, and drawing it down to an acute angle. One gentleman asked me if it was unfashionable in America to wear ear-rings. 'Oh no,' I told him. 'Men as well as women wore them there; not only at the bottom of the ear, but throughout the whole rim, and in their noses besides.'

"One evening, after I was dressed to go out, I stepped into the salon to wait for a carriage. Among other company, there was a great beau of an old bachelor, who knows almost every thing, speaks four languages, sings, and plays the piano, makes speeches that would grace a novel to us all in our turns, sometimes standing and sometimes kneeling, and who is as renowned for impudence as for learning and accomplishments. After making his elegant bow, 'Madam,' said he, 'if you were my wife, I should order you to change that turban for a cap, since you refuse to wear ear-rings.' 'When I am your wife,' said I, 'you will find me very obedient. I hear the carriage—bon soir.'

"It is incredible what a nice eye a French woman has for dress and personal appearance. It is like a musician, whose ear has become so acute, that he discovers discords where to ordinary persons there seems perfect harmony. But they are not in dress, what they are sometimes supposed in our country to be, dashing and finical; but they really understand the matter, and their taste is chaste and correct, and though I will not relinquish my fixed principles, either of morals or taste, yet I endeavour to profit by it; for whatsoever things are really lovely, are to be thought of. Besides, they invent a thousand convenient methods, which I like to learn, many of which I hope to show you when I return. I go through all the shops where various articles of dress are made, and when I see something new, which is promising, buy a specimen to carry home.

"Whatever they may have been in times past, the French women at this day are more simple and natural in their dress, in many respects, than the American. They dress their own hair without false curls; and this is considered (truly I think) more becoming, even when their locks are partially changed by age. At first, the gray hair of ladies, past their youth, elegantly curled and put up, and worn in evening parties without hat or cap, or if these were used, appearing in front, had something displeasing in its aspect. But in truth, the hair, the complexion, and the figure each suit the other; and why should ladies conceal gray hairs more than gen-

tlemen? Some of these ladies prove, as I am told, the most dangerous of coquettes. Yet notwithstanding the assertion of a young gentleman, made in the height of his passion for a woman of twice his age, that he considered a lady's beauty materially improved by her hair's becoming a little gray, yet I am far from believing that this opinion is generally held. I am told there are persons in Paris who earn their living by plucking the white hairs from ladies' heads; and gentlemen's too, for aught I know. One day my consequential French hair-dresser, who comes regularly before dinner, fell into a grave discourse with my sewing-woman, on the point, how far, in the case of female beauty, art would make up for the deficiencies or decays of nature; and he ended by uttering, *'des cheveux et les dents! voila l'essentiel!'*"*

* * * * *

"The French are certainly worthy of imitation, in the facility with which persons of either sex adapt themselves to their situation. No matter who their relations are, or what their former situation may have been,—if poverty comes, or if they see it approaching, they betake themselves to some profitable occupation, not concealing their situation and living on in splendour at the expense of others.

"Much evil among us originates in a prejudice from which the French seem, in a great measure, free;—that there is something degrading in a woman's doing any thing to earn money. In families with us, where the father employs his hands from morning till night in cutting off yards of calico, or tying up pounds of tea, not for charity, but for profit, his daughters would consider it a shocking degradation to employ theirs to earn money, by making caps, or hats, or dresses for others.

"Though I have been sometime in Paris, and I have not been an inattentive observer of the frame of society here, especially in cases where my own sex are concerned, yet I am sensible that I do not understand it sufficiently to pronounce with decision on points, in which as a woman, desirous to promote the good of my sex, I feel an interest. Women here, as is well known, act a more conspicuous part in business affairs than is common in Great Britain or America. The laws too are different; a married woman not being here a nullity. In so far as this may lead to profligacy of manners, I should condemn it.

"But in order that the experiment should be fairly tried here, it would be necessary that Paris should be divested of other causes of profligacy, and then we should know whether a woman's coming forward in mercantile and other business, would of itself produce it. Take from the city its indecent pictures and statues. Let men take their consciences into their own hands. Let them no longer believe that sin can be paid for in money; but believe that it is an account to be settled with the just and omniscient Judge, every man for himself, without other Mediator than the man Christ Jesus; and see then if the useful, though it might be the more public industry of women, than that which is common with us, would produce disorders in society. I do not say it would not, but of this I am confident—that in our frame of society, by going to the opposite extreme, the evils are often produced, which it would seem to be the leading tendency of our customs to avoid.

"For example, suppose with us a young man, with sufficient experience in business to conduct it, but without property, becomes acquainted with a young woman, it may be well educated, but also without property. He loves her, but it checks the native impulse of his affections, because he fancies that his pretty wife must be kept dressed like a doll, and in an elegant parlor, and he has not the means. So he looks out for a woman who

* The hair and the teeth! these are the essentials!

has money, and marries her, though he loves her not—or he lives unmarried—but in either case he is the man to resort to the haunts of vice—perchance to seduce the innocent. And the woman he loved—perhaps had understood the language of his eyes—felt that his heart was hers, and given her own in return;—and she now secretly pines in solitary celibacy. In a country like ours, where industry is rewarded, such things betoken something wrong in custom concerning our sex. Our youth thus throw away their individual happiness; and incur the chance of becoming bad members of society. And the fault does not lie with the men, other than this, that they seem not to have the courage to endeavour to break wrong customs. They are willing to be industrious in their calling, but custom prohibits the woman from becoming that meet and suitable help to the man for which her Creator designed her. An educated woman might become to a merchant his book-keeper, and, as it were, a silent partner in his business—keeping a watch over other agents during his absence—giving him notice of important events, which concern the state of markets;—and in fine, she might render a thousand important services in his affairs, without neglecting the care of her household concerns, the drudgery of which might be performed by uneducated persons, the value of whose time would be trifling to the family, compared with what hers might be made. Understanding the business affairs, and taking an interest in the advancement of the family property, more than in the finery of her dress and furniture, she would need no stern mandate to keep in the ways of economy. If her husband is taken away by death, he parts in peace, as to the condition of his wife and children, for she will know how to settle his affairs, or continue his business.

“These reflections I have been led to make by what I remark here. There are shops which I frequent to make purchases, where great order prevails, and which I am told are wholly under the direction of the mistress in their interior arrangements. One I recollect, a little out of the northwestern Boulevard, where there are two rooms,—one below and the other above. The mistress, a grave and decided woman, keeps her stand behind a counter on one side the door, with a female assistant by her side. They do all the writing in the books. The clerks, of whom there are several, do the selling part; but whatever articles I bought, they were not made into a parcel till they were carried with the bill and the money to her, and the three compared. Then she and her assistant put down in their books the articles and the amount received. And I am told that the whole is compared with the state of the shop before it is closed, so that the clerks have no chance of purloining goods or money. I asked where were the husbands of these women, and was told that they were abroad making purchases, attending to the payments, and watching the state of the markets. Now I do not believe that a woman in a situation like that, industriously employed, is in a more dangerous place than when she is idle in her parlour, or reading novels, or receiving calls from gossips or lounging fops. But I think a middle course between public exposure and the utter uselessness of some of the wives of our shopkeepers, especially those who board instead of keeping house, might be devised, particularly where they are women of intelligence and education.”

There is one passage in the above extract which ought not to be suffered to pass unnoticed; we allude to that which says, “Let men take their consciences into their own hands. Let them no longer believe that sin can be paid for in money.” Mrs. Willard evidently points to the practice of confession enjoined by the Catholic church, the dominant religion of France, and mani-

feasts either what may be styled culpable ignorance, since it has caused her to be guilty of gross misrepresentation and injustice, or what would merit a much severer name and more vehement rebuke. Before she indited the passage in question, conveying so heavy a censure upon the most numerous body of Christians in the world, had she made the proper efforts to inform herself whether it was warranted? This she certainly ought to have done; for it seems to us to be a far less excusable sin to hazard rashly such an accusation, than to look at a statue not decently dressed, which she is so anxious to impress upon her readers she never could prevail on her shrinking delicacy to allow her to do; we take it upon ourselves to assert, that she did not make those efforts; that she has recklessly repeated an oft-denied and oft-refuted calumny. The conscience of the Catholic is as much in his "own hands," as that of the member of any other denomination; he no more believes that there is any virtue in the absolution of the priest, unless he feels that sincere compunction for his sins, and that energetic determination to avoid them for the future, which operate to avert the anger and procure the pardon of God, than does the most earnest Protestant. He cannot, indeed, cherish the hope that he has obtained the remission of the punishment due to his transgressions, until, in all sincerity of heart, he has endeavoured to make some atonement, however slight, comparatively, it may be, to offended justice, in testimony of his conviction how deserving he is of chastisement. With regard to "paying for sin in money," if Mrs. Willard can designate any case of the kind which has come to her knowledge, and indicate the priest, we will join with her in anathematizing him, and holding him up to scorn. "There are black sheep in every flock," according to the old proverb, and we doubt not that some members of the priesthood, who have embraced it for the grovelling purposes of this earth, may avail themselves of their situation to impose upon ignorance and folly in order to attain their ends; but does the isolated perversion of any institution authorize its condemnation? We are well aware that the sale of indulgences was publicly practised at a particular era, and we are as much disposed to censure it as any one can be; it was an abuse which human perversity engrafted upon the pure stem of religion; but there is a wide difference between it and confessional absolution, and it has long since been discontinued.

There are other illiberal and ignorant remarks, in reference to the religion generally professed in Paris, contained in the volume before us, which do not exhibit the Christian charity of our authoress in the most attractive light; among them there is one on which we must be allowed to bestow a passing notice. "Since I have been in France," she says, "I learn that there is a strong

party, and among them are some of the higher clergy, who wish to place religion on its own proper basis, acknowledging not the Pope, but Jesus Christ, as prime head of the Christian church." It must have been a wiseacre, indeed, who furnished her with this wonderful information; there can be no doubt of the truth of it, as far as it goes, but it does not go quite far enough, and we may extend it to its proper length, by communicating to her that not only "some of the higher clergy" of France, but all the higher clergy, and the lower clergy likewise, together with all the higher laity and the lower laity of that and every other Catholic country of the globe, not only "wish to acknowledge Jesus Christ as prime head of the Christian church," but do acknowledge him as such. Had the lady taken the trouble to look in the common Catholic catechism, she would have learnt that the Pope is only the "visible head on earth," constituted for a purpose similar to that for which kings and presidents are required, and that his office no more interferes with the supremacy of the Saviour as the true head of the church, than that of the latter does with the prerogative of the Omnipotent as the Ruler and Governor of the universe.

Of the public amusements of Paris Mrs. Willard has not condescended to notice any, save the French and Italian Operas. We have already copied her account of her visit to the former with General La Fayette. About the other she lucubrates thus:

"I went in the evening to the Italian Opera, by a polite invitation from a French lady, who offered me a box which a friend had invited her to occupy. The piece was the *Barbier de Seville*. The principal performers were *La Blache* in the *Barbier*, and *Madame Mericke La Lande* in *Rosina*.

I was thinking of other things, and not precisely in a humour to be pleased with the performance. Those singers seemed to me to consider it the perfection of singing to shake, and trill, and quaver, and make an enormous squall, and take a breath longer than any one else had ever taken before. It is certainly a physical exertion, at which I can be astonished as well as others; but it is not the soul of music;—it does not find its way to the heart. I have read in books, that it is difficult to define the difference between singing and speaking. That was abundantly exemplified in this performance. There were, without any exaggeration, many sentences pronounced, which, if taken by themselves, would puzzle any ordinary ear to decide whether it was to be called saying or singing. Such passages it is difficult to praise aright. If it is called *saying*, I think it pretty good;—if *singing*, very poor. Yet *La Blache* deserves the credit of possessing a grand bass voice."

Shakspeare, how true thine adage, 'fair is foul !'
To one whose soul is with fruition fraught,
The song of Braham is an Irish howl !

Verily the soul of the person who could "think of other things" whilst under the influence of thy unrivalled music, inimitable Figaro, combined with thine peerless *Rosina*, and thine most gallant *Almaviva*, not forgetting, worthy *Don Bartolo* and *Don Basilio*, the goodly sounds which issue from your mouths

—who could hear nothing but “enormous squalls and shakes” in *Ecco ridente il cielo*, in *Largo al factotum*, in *Una voce poco fa*, in *La calunnia*, without mentioning the all-inspiring duets, and trios, and concerted pieces of all kinds, which constitute an *ensemble* of “divine enchanting ravishment,” that has imparted more general delight than any other offering to Euterpe—must possess a marvellous superfluity of that wonder-working fruition of which the part speaks. In reference to the “thinking” of our authoress upon this occasion, we should be disposed to proceed with the quotation, and affirm that “thinking is but an idle waste of thought.”

La Blache, the *véritable gros de Naples*, as the Paris wags called him from his size and the city whence he came, has indeed a “grand bass voice,” and his personation of the lively, knavish barber, approached, both musically and dramatically, very near to perfection. But magnificent as are his *detonations*, and delicious as are his intonations, we think on the whole he is more than rivalled by the present *primo basso* of the opera, Tamburini. This is the discourser of music, whose voice and skill are pre-eminently calculated to give the world assurance of a singer. The first combines all the qualities requisite for the species of organ to which it belongs—profundity, strength, clearness, mellowness, richness—and of the other, the ecstatic or rather wondering exclamation, which was extorted from an amateur, seated just behind us at a representation of *Mosé in Egitto*, by his execution in the famous duet of that piece, “*Mon Dieu! une voix de basse maniée comme ça!*” may convey some idea. Bass voices, of course, are from their nature the most difficult to tutor into pliability and grace, but so completely has he mastered every impediment, that the most finished soprano or tenor, could scarcely accomplish passages of the greatest intricacy with superior neatness, precision and ease. He has a worthy compeer in Rubini, the first tenor, without doubt, of the present day. David, if he ever was equal to him, which we very much question, has gone by. The voice of Rubini is mellifluous, copious, voluptuous we might even say, in the extreme, and flexible almost to a fault, for, combined with his perfect skill, it seduces him at times into a meretriciousness and redundancy of style which inflicts the same fate upon the original music as that which poor Tarpeia suffered from the cruelty or justice of the Sabines—crushes it under a load of ornaments. This, however, may not be the consequence of his own inclinations, so much as for the purpose of complying with those of the public, whose ears as well as eyes are every where smitten with admiration of gilding and glitter; but if such be the fact, he merits harsher reprehension than would be given to him in the other case. With his pre-

eminence, it is doubly censurable to truckle where he might command, to obey prejudicially for his art, where his dictation would be productive of the utmost advantage, by correcting the vicious taste of his audience.

But it is difficult, at the moment, to quarrel with him on this score, however sober reflection afterwards may create a disposition to find fault, so entirely is the sense of hearing taken captive, or rather fascinated and dazzled, if we may use so strong a figure, by the brilliancy, the exquisite finish, the magical facility of his decorations. In passages requiring energy and fire, he perhaps achieves his highest triumphs—one might as well essay to resist the onward impulse of a torrent, as to remain unmoved by the spirit-stirring eloquence which then pours from his lips. His execution, in conjunction with Tamburini, of the duet of *Mosé*, to which we have alluded, seemed to us to realize all conception of ultimate excellence in music; and such seemed also to be the opinion of the audience that thronged the theatre, judging from the absolute phrenzy of delight to which they were excited. Some of the most enthusiastic amateurs positively bounced from their seats, and appeared to have considerable difficulty in restraining themselves from tearing their hair up by the roots in testimony of their rapture; it is not an altogether inadmissible hyperbole to affirm, that the bravos and encores were of such prolongation and vehemence, that they threatened the stability of the edifice, and would have rendered every one totally deaf for some time afterwards as to any thing else but the repetition of the *morceau*, which was given in compliance with the demand. The second execution of it was even superior to the first; the singers were roused to as high a degree of excitement as the audience, and exerted themselves to the very utmost, emulously displaying all their natural and acquired powers in their fullest perfection. Rubini would now send his voice into the air, and make it play about as if it were a thing of life, buoyant with the animation and frolicsomeness of youth, and as it ceased, Tamburini, amid the ecstatic plaudits which followed, but were suddenly repressed, would catch the strain and continue it in a graver tone, but with equal power, equal beauty, and equal success in eliciting an uproar of applause; thus they went on, each, occasionally, outdoing the other, until, at the conclusion, it would have been as difficult to say to whom the palm ought to have been awarded, as it was for Palæmon to decide in the "great contention" between the singing shepherds Menaleas and Damœtas, whom he deemed equally worthy of the kid. There was one note attained by Rubini in a moment of inspiration, of such unearthly altitude and sweetness, that a half-uttered, wondering "oh!" escaped from every one simultaneously; he dwelt upon it but for an instant; it was

"brief as the lightning in the collied night," but it still lingers in our ears, and as long as they retain the power of recollection, will continue to be heard by them whenever recurred to—such a sound never fell upon them before, and, we fear, will not soon fall upon them again. Nevertheless, we would not dare to say, even when under its influence, that Tamburini was for a second cast into the shade; some of his deep intonations, if not as startling, were as extraordinary in their way, and as replete with the soul of music.

Mrs. Willard might, with justice, have said more about Madam Mérie-Lalande, than merely state that she performed the part of Rosina. This lady, though past the meridian of her faculties, her voice being considerably attenuated, both in compass and volume, by that ruthless personage, Time, still possesses enough of its pristine excellence, unimpaired as is her admirable science, to be considered a *cantatrice* of a superior order. We have heard her as Donna Anna in Don Giovanni, with Malibran as Zerlina, Lablache as Leporello, and Donzelli as the hero, when she sustained herself in a manner worthy of the companionship, and received a flattering share of the enthusiasm of the audience. The present *prima-donna* of the "Opera Italien," Signorina Grisi, is not a star of the first magnitude, capable of shining with an undiminished head in the vicinity of such *lunæ* as Sontag, or Malibran, or Pasta; but in the absence of these, she emits a light with which it is quite feasible to get along with perfect satisfaction. Her voice is clear, of sufficient compass, and by no means devoid of sweetness, but not remarkable for richness or volume; and in managing it, although as yet her musical education is incomplete, her skill is not inadequate to the arduous parts which she assumes. Her earnestness, and apparent desire to please, create of themselves a sentiment in her favour; and at times she manifests a degree of feeling, particularly in Anna Bolena, the master-piece of Donizetti, indicative that nature has not been niggardly in bestowing upon her that important requisite of a singer, soul. She will always be a supreme favourite with the Parisian public, especially from her personal charms, which would blind them to much greater professional inferiority than can be imputed to her with truth. Her appearance is, indeed, one which might excuse a little infatuation in an audience much less susceptible of the power of beauty; it is even worthy of employing the most exquisite strains of her native language in its praise, more than which cannot well be said.

Like every one who gets to Paris, we have been tempted to loiter there so much longer than we ought, that we shall not be able to go any further with Mrs. Willard. On leaving the French metropolis, she "sought, oh Albion! next thy sea-encircled

shore," just as the muses did a good while ago after deserting the Latian plains, and on approaching the white cliffs, felt the influence of those inspiring persons to such a degree, that "poetic thoughts filled her imagination, and she took out her pocket book, and wrote" six lines of very blank verse, when, unfortunately, her "poetic vein was broken in upon by the vulgar affair of eating." The most important matter in this portion of the volume is a full-length letter of recommendation from Miss Edgeworth to the mistress of some school in London, communicated with becoming modesty, by which her readers are informed that Mrs. Willard "has a celebrated establishment for the education of young people near New York;" that she is well known by her literary publications, especially her "History of the United States," and that she is "a distinguished American lady."

ART. VI.—*History of the Hartford Convention, with a review of the policy of the United States Government which led to the war of 1812.* By THEODORE DWIGHT, Secretary of the Convention. New York. 1833.

AN Italian preacher (we believe the anecdote is related by Madame de Stael), wishing, on a certain occasion, to fix the charge of irreligious influence upon Rousseau, enforced his reasoning by the following rhetorical expedient:—Taking from his head the cap universally worn by his order, he threw it down in the pulpit, as the representative of the philosopher, and concluded a pompous invective against his taciturn antagonist after this wise: "Corrupt apostate of Geneva, pernicious Jean Jacques, what reply can you make to my arguments?" After a moment's pause, as though he had awaited the commencement of a new version of the 'Confessions', he placed the cap in its original position, adding, with the air of one who had arrived at a most satisfactory conclusion; "Since you admit your errors, it is needless to adduce proof of their enormity."

This ingenious clerical champion will never be without imitators so long as those topics of controversy remain, in which denunciation is more convenient than argument. Political history abounds in such, and if the work before us deserves any credit, the transaction to which it refers affords a remarkable instance of the extent to which popular credulity may be influenced by bold assertion, unsupported by evidence, and unincumbered by an antagonist.

With the exception of Mr. Otis's letters, this is the first formal examination of the origin and character of the Hartford Convention; an assembly of which it is scarcely necessary at this time to say that it has been, for near twenty years, the theme of much irritating allusion, and of intense if not indecent reprobation. Gradually becoming separated from the transactions with which it was connected, its aims being lost sight of, and its proceedings forgotten, traditionary error has nearly made it infamous, while, with an inconsistency of which party alone could be guilty, its members have retained the confidence, the respect, and the affection of their fellow citizens. Of those who now condemn it, how few know any thing of its origin or object, and how many will start at being informed, that in passing sentence upon its intentions, they must involve in their reproach the governments of three states of the confederacy, and a vast majority of the people of five.

We think better of our countrymen than to believe that they will not rejoice in an opportunity to correct an injurious imputation upon the characters and conduct of those who suffer by its operation; and we congratulate them therefore upon the appearance of a work in which, whatever they may think of its speculative opinions, they can find facts upon which to establish their judgment. The duty they owe to truth, claims at their hands an impartial perusal of those facts. Cato and Socrates, the spirit of party and the spirit of prejudice, may oppose that duty, but they cannot contravene it. Error can never claim a prescription against justice in favour of interest or passion, however late its discovery may have been effected, or however dear the delusion it may have nourished. The more tardy the redress, the more readily and graciously should it be yielded when a claim to it is established; and the injustice of twenty years should hasten to make reparation in a case where death is daily removing its objects.

We conceive that Mr. Dwight has executed a very plain obligation in preparing this work for the press; and while we could wish that he had displayed in its performance fewer of the Achillean characteristics—less of the "*iracundus, inexorabilis, acer*," we must be content, as in most other human efforts, to take the good and the evil together, allowing something moreover for the suppressed indignation of a quarter of a century against slander and misconstruction. It was due to posterity that the history of the Hartford Convention, involving as it does the loyalty and honour of a whole people, should be placed upon a firm and enduring record. It was due to the dead, whose memories have been assailed, to defend their graves from violation;—it was due to the living, whose good name has been attacked, to screen them from unmerited ignominy;—it

was due to the constitution, to the laws, to the cause of good order and good government, and finally, to the friends of civil liberty and universal freedom, that it may be seen with what sobriety and success the people can maintain their rights, though reduced to despondency by suffering, and instigated to resistance by oppression. These are the sanctions under which the duty of the historian was to be executed; a duty greatly independent of trifling considerations of expediency or convenience. Conspicuous characters and important political conjunctures are the property of future generations, whose power of profiting by them depends mainly upon contemporaries. If the task of the latter, therefore, be neglected, or but imperfectly executed, incalculable wrong is done, not only to themselves and their own time, but to those who look to their experience for instruction. In this respect, however, blame is seldom attributable to power and success; they find scribes enough. Octavius Cæsar had poets, orators and historians in abundance; but the Augustan writers said not a word of Cicero. It is the minority that figures ill in history; the vanquished, the unsuccessful, the few; because the pen for the most part is in the hands of their opponents. The lion is no painter, and if he were, he would scarce hold a free pencil with a chain about his neck. Hence it happens that, in the language of an elegant historian,* "fame is more partial to successful aggression than to patriotic resistance;" so much so, that we question if at this moment, even in democratic America, more voices cannot be found in favour of the Stuarts, with all their monstrous usurpation and invented prerogative, than of the judges of Charles the First, who, with some few exceptions, were true patriots, and the preservers of the British constitution. Popular history, by a strange anomaly, always leans to the side of power, and this is the reason that it is popular. "*Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas*" seems alike its motto and its moral. It took all Walpole's ingenuity to obtain common justice for Richard III., but if that prodigy had conquered at Bosworth, he would never have come down to us "deformed and unfinished," a scarecrow and a tyrant.

All this is so far pertinent, that it answers a preliminary objection. The question may be asked, why write this history at all? Why rake up the embers of an expiring controversy, which twenty years have scarce sufficed to cover? Why not leave the honour of the Convention where Ford's heroine left her fame, "to Memory and Time's old daughter, Truth?" For the simple reason that all experience has taught us that memory is always defective and truth frequently perverted. That it is

* Hallam, *Hist. of the Middle Ages*.

ill trusting to an interested adversary with years of uncontradicted assertion to fix an argument upon. Already, in the case before us, newspaper surmises have gradually grown up into rhetorical text, and these, by dint of repetition, are fast forming into materials for history. The conjecture of the first lustrum has become the fact of the fourth, as the midwife's guess at one end of the village makes the gossip's certainty at the other. Emboldened by the silence of the accused, the charge has been recorded as a conviction, and the Hartford Convention has begun to take rank as the second conspiracy known to our monotonous annals. Indeed we are credibly informed that in some churches, whose liturgy is peculiarly patriotic, men include its defeat in their hebdomadal thanksgiving, as some devout protestants on the other side of the Atlantic still do their deliverance from the apocryphal horrors of Oates and Bedloe. With the zeal of such we do not intend to interfere; we only wish to defend the means by which, if they please, it can take a direction a little more "according to knowledge."

If this history therefore was to be written, it has in our judgment been written by the proper individual, and at the proper time. Our author was not a member of the Convention, but the secretary, and the only individual, not a member, who was present at its deliberations. He therefore has the ability to state the facts concerning it, and no personal interest in concealing them. His offence can at the most have been but misprision of sedition; a crime we believe not at present very prominent on our statute book. Of his capacity in a literary point of view, the strong style and perspicuous arrangement of the work itself would afford sufficient evidence, had we not the additional guarantee of a life devoted to kindred pursuits. For the time, we hold it to have been judiciously selected in reference to party, at a period when old land-marks have been partially removed, with some at least of the prejudices which defended them, and while contemporary evidence still exists of their bearing and character; in reference to men, while some of those who suffered wrong are yet alive to receive redress; in reference to history, when patriotism is called upon afresh to check the advances of power, and men are again asking each other where sufferance is to end and remonstrance to begin.

It is not our purpose to follow Mr. Dwight through the preliminary history of five administrations, although the journey would not be without instruction. It occupies the larger part of his octavo, and obviously gives rise in his mind to some reminiscences of bitter and unavailing import. As it would be impossible, however, fully to comprehend the nature and objects of the Convention without some knowledge of the pre-

vious position of the great parties of the republic, we shall borrow from him and other authentic sources a brief sketch of the fundamental measures and principles of each.

The administration of General Washington under the new constitution—itself a subject of serious debate and opposition—was warmly and eagerly opposed by a party, respectable in name and number, who argued that the government had arrogated and exercised, by a remote and arbitrary implication, powers never delegated to it by that instrument; and that its policy led by a direct and inevitable tendency to the destruction of the rights of the states and the establishment of a great central and consolidated authority. To this party, the secretary of the treasury, General Hamilton, as the supposed originator of most of the offensive measures, was peculiarly obnoxious, and at its head was eventually placed Mr. Jefferson, who had always advocated its doctrines, though for a time he had been a member of the administration. All the prominent measures of Hamilton—and in shaping the career of a nation these could neither be few nor unimportant—were met at the threshold by stern and uncompromising resistance. Among these measures the most conspicuous were the funding system, with its concomitants, the assumption of the state debts, the national bank and the excise. Of the policy and importance of most of them subsequent experience has given ample evidence, and political opponents who censured their adoption have been constrained to acknowledge the sagacity of their projector. It has been reserved for our own time to unlearn the lessons of nearly half a century, and in a remarkable instance to wage war against an institution co-ordinate with the organization of the government, and recognized in turn by each successive party as essential to the national prosperity. It is but justice to the gallant and gifted man to whom the country owes that institution, and other features of its first financial system, to say here, that political zeal has seldom selected for persecution a brighter intellect, a more perspicacious and penetrating genius, a readier intuition for truth, or a sounder judgment to apply it. We believe that his purposes were as pure as his talent was exalted, and that if he had ambition, it was the ambition of a high and noble mind, pursuing great objects by lofty means, courting the dangerous rather than the devious, and, in the prosecution of duty, scorning alike the menace of power and the meanness of party:

“———— Sævus at illum
Exitus eripuit, quem mirabantur Athenæ
Torrentem et pleni moderantem fræna theatri.”

In the meantime the French revolution served, by its influence on the popular feeling, to complete the separation which

domestic differences had commenced, and, singularly enough, gave a tone to the principles of either party, which continued to designate them until the peace of 1814. A portion of the people was mad for a French alliance, and discontented, after the drunken and bloody mummeries of the faubourgs, with the guise of a sober and matronly republicanism. Genet and his Gauls "thundered at the Capitol," and Washington's house was surrounded from day to day by a multitude denouncing England, and huzzaing for the French republic. The steadiness of the chief magistrate, seconded by most of the property and influence of the nation, succeeded in abating, if not in calming, the tempest; and the final action of Congress upon Jay's treaty secured the neutrality of the United States for the period of ten years, to which the provisions of that treaty were limited. It is superfluous to say that this measure was not carried without vehement and protracted resistance, and that, in the war of conflicting interests and contending passions which accompanied and followed its adoption, the strife was indiscriminate and uncompromising.

The measures of the succeeding administration have been deeply stigmatized by its opponents, and certainly tended very little to unite the adverse interests of the republic. Its chief was placed, by the force of circumstances, in a disadvantageous position, between the personal popularity of his predecessor and the political influence of the future incumbent. The setting and the rising sun each cast a shadow upon him. Obloquy, forgetful of past services, spared not his best designs, and indiscriminating opposition aroused, in return, some principles which had been learnt on the wrong side of the guillotine. The country was in a state of rapid transition, and any attempt to controul the popular progress was as vain as it was impolitic; insomuch, that we doubt if Washington himself could have sustained the government upon its original footing, against the tide of hostile impulses that overthrew his successor.

In a document hereafter to be noticed, a high authority has asserted, that the treasonable design which finally eventuated in the Hartford Convention, had its origin in the annexation of Louisiana to the Union in 1803. Of the existence of such a design we shall speak anon; meanwhile, as the Louisiana treaty was among the earlier acts of Mr. Jefferson's administration, we may be said already to have arrived at that point where the history of parties has a direct bearing upon the principal topic of our consideration. On the great questions which henceforth agitated the country, the policy of the government, from this period to the end of the war, proceeded upon uniform principles, and was met by the opposition, and particularly that part of it which resided east of the Hudson, with an unvarying re-

sistance. Indeed, a struggle still earlier than that which succeeded the Louisiana measure had been made against a doctrine, then for the first time avowed, though cautiously and under strong reprobation, but which in our own day has been carried into frightful and dangerous development—we mean the principle of political proscription, or, in the felicitous phrase of a modern senator, that exercise of power “which awards to the victor the spoils of the vanquished.” We glory in the fact, that this perversion of office was opposed in its very cradle, and we claim the right, as citizens and freemen, to protest against it now, by whomsoever advanced, and by whomsoever exercised, as fraught with inconceivable peril to the liberties of the republic, trenching upon the fundamental rights of the citizen, and offering the most sacred trusts of the country in barter for blind devotion and a prostituted franchise. We will permit no opportunity to pass of expressing our abhorrence of that abuse of patronage which converts the servants of the people into a band of mercenaries, supple to do official will, and ready to follow official pleasure. It leads to the perpetuation of power by the worst of all possible modes—the corrupting influence of money—and, realizing the fable of the eagle, paralyzes the spirit of freedom by the very means which freedom itself supplies.

The opposition, then, after Mr. Jefferson’s election, objected to the principle and the practice of proscription, and to the acquisition and annexation of new states without the limits of the original confederacy. They objected moreover to the repeal of the judiciary law, to the rescission of the taxes, and to the neglect of the means of national defence, particularly the fortification of the coast and the navy. But principally and especially they objected to a series of measures, begun during the second administration of Mr. Jefferson and continued under his successor, well known to the history of those times as *the restrictive system*, and consisting of regulations eminently prejudicial, as was admitted on all sides, to the interests of the eastern states. From the adoption of this system in 1806 to the declaration of war in 1812, they never ceased to remonstrate against it as a violation of the constitution, and as a sacrifice of their very existence to a visionary and impracticable policy. This at last comprised the whole debateable ground. “The object of the opposition antecedent to the war,” says Mr. Otis,* “is comprized in two words,—the restrictive system. In all its moods and tenses—through all its labyrinths of embargo, non-importation and non-intercourse, with its acts supplemental and explanatory, and all its reduplication of pains and penalties on land and water. It was to this system, and this alone, to which

* Letter xii.

any idea of serious discontent or disaffection could be attached." In the rapid glance we are compelled to give this part of our subject, we are not enabled to enter even into the details of the history of this obnoxious system, much less to go into the argument upon it, so ably enforced by Dexter and others before the constitutional tribunals of the country. Its effects upon New England are painted in colours which are still vivid enough to arrest attention, in the eloquent appeals of more than one of her sons. We have placed our pen upon it, with no intention to convert or excite, but simply to call the attention of those of our readers whose interest in politics is of more modern date, to a principal source of discontent with that party which subsequently opposed the war, and the remote cause of the measure of which Mr. Dwight is the historian.

— With a right arm palsied by six years of hostile legislation (we speak not of design, but effect), New England was called upon to meet the war of 1812—a fight for which, without disparagement to her courage, be it said, "she had no stomach." Her representatives asserted, and they were sustained by large bodies of their fellow-citizens in other states, that the war implied an alliance *de facto* with France, that it sacrificed the commercial interest, that its objects were not feasible, and that the country was totally unprovided with means for its successful prosecution. Its alleged objects were two, of which the first was to obtain the repeal of the British orders in council, the second, to protect our seamen from British impressment. It is a matter of little consequence, perhaps, to the argument, but the remark is in place here, that neither of these objects was attained by the resort to arms, the orders in council having been repealed before the annunciation of hostilities reached England, and the topic of impressment—the "*teterrima causa belli*,"—standing now, and ever since, exactly where it stood on the 19th of June 1812. Of this, however, by the way. It was objected to those who supported the war, as a measure necessary to sustain the dignity and honour of the country, that the situation of two thousand miles of ill-fortified sea-coast, a treasury exhausted by the long stagnation of active and profitable industry, and a deficiency of the *matériel* of warfare, particularly arms and military stores, were circumstances but indifferently calculated to produce the desired results; and some who recollected the Berlin, Milan and Rambouillet decrees, suggested that, if we were to engage in a losing contest, it would be more magnanimous to select for an enemy a power who was apparently striding to universal empire, than one who was left almost alone in the strife for civil freedom—

"Et puis qu'il faut que vous soyez damnés,
Damnez-vous donc pour des fautes aimables."

It is not to be denied that the North had a strong interest in the preservation of peace, arising out of her peculiar position and pursuits; but that she would have sacrificed that interest, had she believed the war essential to the national honour, can be doubted by no one who ever read the history of the revolution. There has been too much misapprehension upon this subject, designedly kept alive, since the passion in which it originated has subsided. The opposition of New England to the war has been connected with a totally different matter—a resistance to the government in its prosecution, and a culpable refusal to bear her share of its burdens. Now we assert, without fear of contradiction, and as a matter of simple justice to an injured party, that, except in the single affair of the militia (which involved a most important constitutional question), New England failed in no duty to the nation, while at the same time she defended her own coast, from Passamaquoddy to Sandy Hook, and advanced the means of maintenance to regulars of her own raising, and to her militia, to the amount of millions; for a portion of which, at least one ancient commonwealth 'is still a suppliant—not a suppliant, for she asks no alms—but a claimant on the justice of the nation.

We have adverted to a constitutional question, arising out of a requisition by the general government upon the New England states for their quota of militia, directed to be raised under the act of 20th April 1812. This question becomes important to our subject; because out of it, and considerations connected with it, grew the whole scheme of the Hartford Convention. The requisition was made upon the Governors of Connecticut and Massachusetts, by General Dearborn, three days after the declaration of war. Compliance with it was refused by those magistrates, acting under the advice and sanction of their legitimate counsellors, upon the ground that the right of Congress to provide for calling out the militia is limited to certain emergencies, and that none of those emergencies were shown to exist; and by the Governor of Connecticut, upon the additional ground, that the constitution and laws of the United States guaranteed to the militia of the several states the right to be commanded by their own officers, and that the requisition of General Dearborn violated that right, by directing the troops for which it called to be placed under the command of an officer of the United States army. Without stopping to decide between the parties to this issue, it will be readily perceived that it involves a question of no inconsiderable magnitude to the rights of the states, being no less than the power of the general government, immediately upon a declaration of war, to command the services and appoint the officers of the whole military force of the country; and, by repeating the requisition, to controul it

for an unlimited period." It was this that excited the alarm of New England; and, whether her citizens were right or wrong in the approval they gave of the executive refusal, it cannot but be acknowledged, that there was much that was startling and ominous in the propositions against which it was directed. Something will be granted by the most bigoted advocate of the powers of the federal government, to a jealous, and, perhaps, overweening watchfulness, at a period of distrust and dread, over the liberties of the citizen; particularly in a case of such vital and enduring importance. If Hampden has been immortalized for contesting a paltry tax, on account of the principle it involved, and the fathers of our own freedom found fame and honour in the destruction of as trifling an instrument of tyranny, the motive that vindicated a constitutional construction favourable to personal liberty, should not be too harshly judged, nor too readily condemned. It was unfortunate that, on both sides, the peculiar interests and passions of the time intervened to cloud the judgment; but that is a misfortune attendant upon all opposition to measures of doubtful right, and is necessarily enhanced by the importance of the emergency in which such measures are attempted. Whether the states were abstractedly right on the constitutional question, is a matter of little importance, provided their design was honest, and their argument fair, forcible, and unimpugned by that of their antagonists. With what strength they sustained their position, may be seen in the history of the transaction given by Mr. Dwight (pp. 233. 275), which few Americans will read without acknowledging it to present a case in which difficulties of no ordinary character were met with the firmness and temper of men who believed that they were resisting an unlawful encroachment upon their liberties, and an undue exercise of power.*

Connected with this subject of the militia, though originating much later, was the plan devised by the administration to raise eighty thousand troops, by means of a general classification of the whole white population of the country capable of

* We are perfectly aware that this question, so far as it depends on the exclusive right of the president to judge of the exigencies on which the militia is to be called out, was set at rest in 1827, by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Martin v. Mott*, 12 Wheaton's Reports, 19. Had that decision been pronounced antecedently to June 1812, it would have removed a most serious source of collision between the national executive and the Governors of the eastern states, although the claim of the former, virtually to appoint the officers of all the militia actually in service, would still have furnished ample justification to the latter for declining to comply with the requisitions of the military commanders in New England.

bearing arms. Great alarm was caused by this project, which, as the bill introduced by Mr. Giles in the Senate, for the purpose of carrying it into effect never became a law, is now but little known. As a historical document of some weight, in the consideration of the measures of the opposition, we shall introduce it here, from the report of the secretary of war. Its principal details are as follows:

"Let the free male population of the United States, between eighteen and forty-five years of age, be formed into classes of one hundred men each, and let each class furnish men for the war, within thirty days after the classification, and replace them, in the event of casualties.

"The classification to be formed with a view to the equal distribution of property among the several classes.

"If any class fails to provide the men required of it, within the time specified, they shall be raised by draft upon the whole class; any person thus drafted being allowed to furnish a substitute.

"The present bounty in land being allowed to each recruit, and the present bounty in money which is paid to each recruit by the United States, to be paid to each draft, by all the inhabitants within the precinct of the class within which the draft may be made, equally, according to the value of the property which they may respectively possess; and if such bounty be not paid within days, the same to be levied on all the taxable property of the whole precinct.

"The recruits to be delivered over to the recruiting officer in each district, to be marched to such places of general rendezvous as may be designated by the department of war."—*Dwight*, pp. 318, 319.

As this plan was not carried into effect, we shall not build any argument upon the fact that it contravenes entirely every provision of the constitution in relation to the militia. It was considered at the time indicative of a design on the part of the administration, to effect by conscription what they could not effect by contract or requisition, and in that view created an additional incentive to opposition in those states which had previously resisted the demands of General Dearborn. This, however, as we have said, was at a much later period of the war.

Shortly subsequent to the refusal of the governors of Massachusetts and Connecticut to obey the requisition of General Dearborn, a communication was transmitted to them from that officer, stating that he had received orders to withdraw the troops of the United States from the vicinity of the coast, and that a portion of it must therefore be left "with less protection than prudence would have justified, if a suitable number of the militia should not be ordered out, in conformity with the views and intentions of the President, as heretofore expressed." It is not known to us how large a force of regulars was left for the protection of seven hundred miles of coast, nor is it very material, since it was confessedly inadequate, and so continued to the close of the war. Certain officers, detached without force, remained in each military district, but their presence was product-

ive of very little benefit to the defence of the country, since their intercourse with the officers of the militia was not of the most harmonious kind. After the withdrawal of General Dearborn, measures were immediately taken by Connecticut and Massachusetts to provide a substitute for the force withdrawn by him, and these measures were continued until the termination of hostilities. Large detachments were actually in the field during a considerable portion of that time, and the whole body of militia of the state of Massachusetts was in readiness for instant service. These facts ought, in justice to those states, to be distinctly remembered.

“The authorities of Massachusetts and Connecticut, (says Mr. Dwight,) have been so often charged with having refused to order out the militia of those states, upon the call of the President of the United States, and they have been so frequently and so loudly reproached for this conduct, that there are good reasons for believing that a great proportion of the inhabitants of the United States, and especially that large number of them who have come upon the stage of active life since the close of the war of 1812, have been fully impressed with the idea that the militia of those states were never in the field during the war, but were entirely withheld from the public service. The facts which have been stated will serve to remove such an impression wherever it may exist. The militia were never withheld from the public service; but in both states, when the exigencies of the times required, were in large numbers in the field. And in Connecticut they were not merely encamped for the purpose of preventing or repelling invasion, but they were out, in large numbers, for two successive seasons, for the purpose of defending the property of the United States, and preventing the destruction of the squadron of armed ships in the harbour of New London.”—Pp. 284, 285.

During all this time New England had promptly met the demands of the national government, in the shape of taxes for the common defence, although her means had been nearly exhausted by the stagnation of commerce during seven years of restriction and war. Unable to defend her extensive coast, vulnerable in so many points, and unprotected by a naval force, her towns had been invaded and burned, and her citizens harassed by unintermitted duty. In the midst of her greatest alarm, at prospective and renewed invasion, the general government refused farther pay and provisions to the numerous militia she had been compelled to levy for the preservation of the property and lives of her inhabitants. We speak not of motive—but fact. The refusal may have originated in the necessities of the government—it may have originated in its pleasure. Its bearing upon New England was the same in either case. She was in effect told that, henceforth, she must meet the exigencies of the war against an enemy placed, by the pacification in Europe, in possession of augmented means, with such resources as the patriotism of her citizens could supply. It was an emergency for which, separately, the states were not prepared. Suffering

under a common calamity, they deemed that they ought to pursue common counsels, little dreaming that a conference upon the best means of defence could be construed into a combination to betray their liberties and cast off their allegiance.

That the provision of those means was the object of the Hartford Convention, the language of the Massachusetts legislature, where the scheme originated, explicitly shows:

"Resolved, That twelve persons be appointed, as delegates from this commonwealth, to meet and confer with delegates from the other New England states, or any other, upon the subject of their public grievances and concerns; and upon the best means of preserving our resources; and of defence against the enemy; and to devise and suggest for adoption, by those respective states, such measures as they may deem expedient," &c.,—(P. 342.)

the rest of the resolution having reference to amendments of the constitution. And in the circular letter, written by direction of the legislature, and inclosing the resolutions, the language used is still more distinct:

"The general objects of the proposed conference are, first, to deliberate upon the dangers to which the eastern section of the Union is exposed by the course of the war, and which there is too much reason to believe will thicken round them in its progress; and to devise, if practicable, means of security and defence which may be consistent with the preservation of their resources from total ruin, and adapted to their local situation, mutual relations and habits, and not repugnant to their obligations as members of the Union."—P. 343.

The resolutions adopted by Connecticut and Rhode Island are of similar tenor and import, and the measure was considered by those with whom it originated, and by whom it was adopted, as having only an indirect and subsidiary reference to the second object proposed in the Massachusetts resolution, viz. the proposed amendments of the constitution.

The Hartford Convention then, had its origin in a state of suffering common alike to each of the states represented in it. It had for its object the relief of that suffering by a concert of action for the preservation of the resources and the defence of the territory of New England. Its members acted under special instructions, by which the nature of their deliberations was fixed, and the extent of their powers was limited. They had the right, under their charter, to confer, consult and recommend for adoption, such measures as their combined wisdom should deem appropriate; always provided they were pertinent to the objects proposed, and consistent with the federal obligations of their principals. On the face of their instructions there was nothing which contravened any constitutional obligation, while there was every qualification which could indicate a recognition of the lawful authority of the federal government. All this has been virtually acknowledged, and an attempt has been made

to infer from it, that the members of the Convention acted upon some secret design or understanding in direct and utter contradiction of their ostensible object. To so illogical a deduction we might simply content ourselves with replying, that it does not appear; but we will hereafter take a more formal notice of it. In the meanwhile, we vouch the evidence recorded in the resolutions of these legislatures as the best indication of their motives and intentions.

The Convention, consisting of twelve members from Massachusetts, seven from Connecticut, and four from Rhode Island, delegated by the legislatures of their respective states, together with two from New Hampshire and one from Vermont, the representatives of local assemblies in those states, met at Hartford on the 15th day of December 1814, and at the end of three weeks adjourned, after adopting a report, accompanied by a series of resolutions, embracing the principal topics to which their instructions had adverted, as the result of their labours. Of this report Mr. Dwight truly says that,

“The expectations of those who apprehended that it would contain sentiments of a seditious, if not of a treasonable character, were entirely disappointed. They looked in vain for either the one or the other, and were obliged to acknowledge that no such sentiments were to be found in it. Equally free was it from advancing doctrines which had a tendency to destroy the union of the states. On the contrary, it breathed an ardent attachment to the integrity of the republic. Its temper was mild, its tone moderate, and its sentiments were liberal and patriotic.”—P. 380.

It was an elevated and manly declaration by men conscious of their rights, yet unwilling to invoke extreme sanctions, holding on to the constitution and the Union, though they had ceased to derive assistance from the one or protection from the other, and looking to the judgment of another generation for that justice which they were likely to be denied by the passion of their own. In the resolutions accompanying their report, they recommended to their respective legislatures to adopt measures to protect their citizens “from the operation of drafts, conscriptions or impressments, not authorized by the constitution;”—to make application to the government of the United States for “their consent to some arrangement by which the said states might either separately or in concert, assume upon themselves the defence of their territory; and that a reasonable proportion of the taxes collected within said states, might be paid into their respective treasuries, and appropriated to the payment of the balance due said states, and to their future defence;” and to pass laws “authorizing the governors or commanders-in-chief of their militia, to make detachments from the same, or to form voluntary corps, as shall be most convenient and conformable to their constitutions, and to cause the same to be well armed, equipped and disciplined, and held in

readiness for service, and upon the request of the governor of either of the other states, to employ the whole of such detachments or corps, as well as the regular forces of the state, or such part thereof as may be required and can be spared consistently with the safety of the state, in assisting the state making such request to repel any invasion thereof, which shall be made or attempted by the public enemy." They also passed a resolution, recommending amendments to the constitution, in relation to representation and direct taxes, the admission of new states, the power to lay embargoes, to restrict commercial intercourse, and to declare war, the eligibility of aliens to office and the re-election of the same person to the office of President of the United States. Such was the "conjuration and the mighty magic" of the Hartford Convention; a body powerless in the first place to do harm, free in the second place from the intention of doing harm, and innocent in the third place of the act of having done harm. So far, in fact, was Congress from perceiving any thing seditious, or even unreasonable, in their proceedings, that on the 27th day of January following their adjournment, a bill, ratifying the principal object of their meeting, which had previously passed both houses, received the signature of the President. That bill provided that—

"The President of the United States be, and he is hereby authorized and required to receive into the service of the United States any corps of troops, which may have been or may be raised, organized, and officered under the authority of any of the states, whose term of service shall not be less than twelve months; which corps, when received into the service of the United States, shall be subject to the rules and articles of war, and employed in the state raising the same, or in an adjoining state, and not elsewhere, except with the assent of the executive of the state so raising the same."

And the second section provides that—

"The corps, so as aforesaid accepted under this act, shall be armed and equipped at the expense of the United States, and shall be entitled to the same pay, clothing, rations, forage, and emoluments of every kind, and (bounty excepted) to the same benefits and allowances as the regular troops of the United States."*

This act covered the whole controversy which had involved New England with the national government, inasmuch as it provided for the defence of the country at the common expense, and recognized the claim of the states in the appointment of their own officers, and their right to the services of their own troops. Had it been passed before the 15th December 1814, there is every reason for believing that the Convention would not have assembled; and had the war continued long enough to

* 2 Story's L. U. S. 1486, 1487.

test its provisions, they would have conduced most essentially to the general harmony and safety.

We think it must by this time be apparent, that, admitting the right of the Convention to assemble at all, its object and proceedings, judging from the face of the record, were strictly loyal, legal, and constitutional. We have hitherto assumed that right as scarcely liable to a question, and nothing but the respect due to those who decently and conscientiously (but, we are convinced, without much examination) have doubted it, would induce us to discuss so fundamental a privilege. If the states have reserved every power which they have not expressly delegated, the question is at an end, unless some provision of the constitution can be pointed out in which they have abridged that most essential one, the liberty of mutual consultation—a power which has been exercised almost with the change of every moon since the birth-day of the confederacy. The only limitation in the constitution, which can bear upon the subject, is that in the 10th section of the first article, which declares that “no state shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any *agreement or compact* with another state.” To say that a mutual interchange of determination on the part of two or more states, to ask the consent of Congress to any proposed agreement or compact, is itself an agreement or compact, and thus a violation of the constitution, is to destroy the whole spirit of the provision, for without some such previous reciprocal understanding, intimation, or contract—call it what you please—the wishes of the parties to the future agreement can never be made known to each other. The truth is, that the mutual resolution to apply for consent, is only a primary and necessary step towards an agreement to be completed afterwards, by the ratification and approbation of Congress, without which it is of no validity or force, and void *ab initio*. It becomes a *compact* in the sense of the constitution by the completion of its final element, precisely as a writing in a certain form becomes a deed by the fulfilment of the last term of its definition. It will be recollected that we are considering merely the right of the Convention to assemble for the purposes specified in their commission, without reference at all for the present to their actual proceedings, which we have previously endeavoured to show were unexceptionable. They were special agents, with a limited authority, representing the authority of the states by which they were delegated, only within the four sides of the paper which contained the resolutions authorizing their appointment. Had they therefore made a compact purporting to bind their respective states in the strictest form, they would by so much have exceeded the bounds of their trust; but this could not have

affected the constitutionality of their meeting for other purposes not prohibited, and within their delegated authority. Their constituents would have refused to recognize their proceedings, and the disgrace would have rested with themselves.

But it has been objected that, granting the constitutionality of the Convention, the measure was inexpedient. We conceive that to this there is a short and simple answer. Either the motives and aims of its members were honest, or they were not. If the latter, the question of expediency is a minor one, and merges in the guilty design of bringing civil war and disunion upon the country. When the dishonesty is proved, the inexpediency will be admitted. But if there was no improper design, and the true motive for assembling the Convention was asserted, the expediency of the measure depended upon the importance of the emergency, concerning which opinions may differ, but of which the party most interested claimed the right, in the absence of a common umpire, of judging for herself, and submitting the reasons of her judgment to the country. If those reasons were potent and imperative—if that emergency was desperate and unprecedented, requiring unusual and instant remedies, she may safely claim that those to which she resorted were the most unexceptionable within her cognizance, and appeal to results for the vindication of her conduct. The main ground on which this inexpediency is argued against honest intentions and innocent results, is that the tendency of the Convention was to encourage the enemy. Granting this for a moment to be the fact, and that it was an evil, it could be but a temporary one, and was counterbalanced by the greater good of providing means to resist his farther designs. But it would be as difficult to show in what manner an assembly convened for the express and almost single purpose of devising means of defence against an enemy could have a tendency to encourage him, as it would be illogical to conclude, from the fact that he suspended his hostile operations after the session of the Convention, that he actually was encouraged.

But the grand article of impeachment, to which the rest are but secondary and subsidiary, is that the Convention entertained the design of destroying the Federal Union, and erecting a northern confederacy, under the auspices of England; and when it is replied that no such intention appears upon the face of its proceedings, the answer is ready, that the evidence has been suppressed. To obviate any inference of this sort, the Journal of the Convention was in 1819 placed, by Mr. Cabot, its president, in the office of the secretary of the state of Massachusetts, for public inspection and examination, accompanied by the following certificate:

"I, George Cabot, late president of the Convention assembled at Hart-

ford, on the 15th day of December 1814, do hereby certify that the foregoing is the original and only Journal of the proceedings of that Convention; and that the twenty-seven written pages which compose it, and the printed report, comprise a faithful record of all the motions, resolutions, votes and proceedings of that Convention: and I do further certify, that this Journal has been constantly in my exclusive custody from the time of the adjournment of the Convention to the delivery of it into the office of the secretary of this commonwealth.

"*Boston Nov. 16th 1819.*

"GEORGE CABOT."

In corroboration of this evidence, we extract from another part of Mr. Dwight's History, the testimony of another member of the Convention, delivered by him on oath, before the supreme court of the state of Connecticut, in the year 1831.

"There was not, to the best of my recollection, a single motion, resolution or subject of debate, but what appears in the Journal. I believe I know their proceedings perfectly; and that every measure done or proposed, has been published to the world."—P. 404.

To this we subjoin Mr. Dwight's own testimony, who declares that he does not hesitate to say in the most positive manner—

"That the Journal and the Report of the Convention contain a full, complete, and specific account of all the motions, votes and proceedings of the Convention. And we will add, that no proposition was made in the Convention to divide the Union, to organize the New England states into a separate government, or to form an alliance with Great Britain or any other foreign power."—P. 405.

Upon this evidence, we shall take it for granted, until proof is adduced to the contrary, that the proceedings of the Convention are all before the public; nor shall we gratify groundless cavil, by stopping to inquire how far men of blameless life and irreproachable character may, in certifying that fact, be presumed to have paltered with their consciences or trifled with their oaths. Those who have standards of their own to measure degrees of perjury, will find it an agreeable task. In the meantime, that testimony of guilt which suppressed journals, themselves apocryphal, could not furnish, has been sought from other sources, and the forgotten surmises of another era have been invoked in aid of the parties and projects of this.

Inferences of treasonable intention on the part of the members of the Hartford Convention, have been derived from alleged designs of the dominant party in New England, inconsistent with the integrity of the Union, beginning so remotely as 1803, and continuing to the close of the war. The existence of these designs, so far as we have been enabled to discover, is supposed to be established mainly by the disclosures of John Henry, in 1812; and by the statements of a more distinguished individual in 1828. The first of these sources of evidence is entitled to some notice, as connected with an exciting transaction in the history of the time; and the second, though a mere assertion

of belief, unfortified by any published or revealed proof, claims attention by virtue of the dignified station of its author.

John Henry then was a subject of Great Britain, who for some time resided in the United States, and held a commission in its army. Having resigned his commission, he became a resident of the British provinces, and, in the beginning of the year 1809, was employed by Sir James Craig, governor-general of Canada, to visit the United States, with a view to ascertain how far the prevailing political party of their eastern section would feel disposed to countenance a dissolution of the Union, and a connexion with England. It appears that, in pursuance of the objects of his mission, he reached Boston about the end of February, and remained there until the end of May, on the 25th of which month he intimated to his employer, that his longer presence there "could contribute very little to the interests of Great Britain." Such also was the opinion of Sir James, for his letter of recall, dated May 4th, was already on its way. In 1811 Henry repaired to England, in order to obtain compensation for his services, but his claim was rejected by the ministry; and on the 20th of February 1812, he addressed a letter to the secretary of state, Mr. Monroe, enclosing the documents and correspondence relating to his mission, stating that, in doing so, he was "influenced by a just resentment of the perfidy and dishonour of those who first violated the conditions upon which he received their confidence;"—a delicate mode of intimating that he had not obtained his reward. The President transmitted copies of the communication and documents to Congress, who referred the subject to a committee, with power to send for persons and papers. The only portion of the report of this committee material to the present inquiry, is that in which they state, that "from the careful concealment on the part of Henry of every circumstance which could lead to the discovery and punishment of any individuals in the United States (should there be any such) who were criminally connected with him, no distinct object was presented to the committee, by his communication, for the exercise of the power with which they were invested, of sending for persons and papers." It would have been difficult indeed for the committee to fix a charge, from the evidence of Henry, upon any inhabitant of New England, for, as is well remarked by Mr. Dwight—

"During the whole period of Henry's residence in Boston, it does not appear that he ever conversed with a single individual respecting the object of his mission; that any overtures of the kind alluded to were ever made to him; nor does he mention the name of even a solitary person who ever uttered, even by accident, a sentence of disaffection to the union of the states, or of a wish to form a connexion with Great Britain."—P. 210.

We have taken his story, so far as it goes, as true; we care

not whether it be true or false, nor should we have bestowed a moment's attention upon it, save for the consideration mentioned above, and the fact, that from time to time it is still alluded to in connection with certain names and events, as if it really had contained something to establish the charges which have been founded upon it. The probability is, that this adventurer, having from a residence in this country gained some knowledge of parties, and measuring other men's loyalty by his own, obtained the confidence of Sir James Craig, failed to fulfil his part of the contract, and after being bandied between the renunciation of the Governor and the disclaimer of the ministry till his means were expended, came to the United States to obtain, by denouncing his old employer, the wages of a double dishonour.*

We approach the second source of unfavourable inference to which we have alluded, with all the respect due to the great services, high political and personal merit and distinguished station of its author; but our disposition to avoid its examination is qualified by the recollection, that its disclosure was intended to affect merit as exalted, services as important, and station almost as elevated as his own.

In the year 1828, the then President of the United States declared, in a communication authorized by him in the *National Intelligencer*, that during the session of Congress of 1808, he had informed his confidential correspondents that he knew, from unequivocal evidence, although not proveable in a court of law, that the object of certain leaders of the party which had in its hands the management of the legislature of Massachusetts was, and had been for several years, "a dissolution of the Union, and the establishment of a separate confederation; and that, in case of a civil war, the aid of Great Britain to effect that purpose would be as surely resorted to, as it would be indispensably necessary to the design." And in a communication to certain citizens of Massachusetts, who had requested the production of the evidence on which the charge rested, Mr. Adams adds, "That project, I repeat, had gone to the length of fixing upon a military leader for its execution; and although the circumstances of the time never admitted of its execution, nor even of its full development, I had yet no doubt, in 1808 and 1809, and have no doubt at this time, that it is the key to all the great movements of these leaders of the federal party in New England, from that time forward, till its final catastrophe in the Hartford Convention."† The proofs in support of

* Henry received \$50,000 from the United States.

† Correspondence between John Quincy Adams, Esq., President of the

this opinion of Mr. Adams not being produced, and it being admitted that they are not such as would suffice to establish the charge in a court of law, the opinion remains, for all purposes of evidence, utterly insignificant. A similar inference from concealed premises, backed by the reputation of the most sagacious lawyer in the universe, would not convict a defendant at the sessions of the larceny of a sixpence. But it is not in this light that the subject need be viewed. Thirteen citizens of Massachusetts, who arrogated nothing when they undertook the cause of the "leaders" of that party which had fallen under reprehension, and claimed to have been cognizant of their views, opposed their solemn negative to their accuser's assertion of belief, their characters to his character, their argument to his argument. It is of little consequence that it was objected that these gentlemen were not necessarily included in the charge. Common consent, and the records of the commonwealth, had placed them among the most prominent members of the party designated for a series of years; and it is contrary to every reasonable probability to suppose that they were profoundly ignorant of the main, the great, the grand design of that party from 1803 to 1815; while under the indefinite phrase of "certain leaders," who had fixed upon a military chief to head a rebellion, we are to look for a limited number of obscure village partizans, plotting in a corner of the state. At present we feel justified in believing that Mr. Adams overrated the weight of the evidence on which he relied; an opinion which, at the worst, does him no injustice, since, should its correctness be established, his misfortune would be a very common one.

The design, therefore, which had its "final catastrophe in the Hartford Convention," depends upon the weight to be attached to the deductions of one individual (for Henry's communications, according to the report of the committee, impeached nobody) from remote and concealed sources of information. To say nothing of the different effect produced by the same evidence upon different minds, or of the peculiar relation in which that individual stood to the party charged, let us examine the case upon its probabilities. Certain unnamed leaders of a political party, in the year 1803, being dissatisfied with the Louisiana treaty, conceived the purpose of forming a new confederacy; but the time not being ripe for its execution, they retained the project within their own bosoms for a future occasion. In 1806 a system was commenced by the general government hostile, as these leaders supposed, to their dearest interests, and infringing their constitutional rights, yet no steps were taken to forward

United States, and several citizens of Massachusetts. Boston, 1829.
Mr. Dwight has made no allusion to this correspondence.

a design, to the completion of which new and violent incentives had been superadded. In 1808, although the obnoxious system continued to press upon them with aggravated effect, the serpent still remained harmless in the egg, nor could the complaints of a whole people induce him to burst the shell. The presence of a British emissary, in 1809, duly commissioned to forward the "precious mischief," produced not a single conference in furtherance of a conspiracy already beginning to outlive its projectors. It lingered through near six years more of harmless senility, "letting 'I dare not' wait upon 'I would,'" until it finally exploded, not in the roar of cannon under the guidance of its military leader, but in the report of a peaceable and constitutional assembly, the grave representatives of sovereign states, whose sole object was to oppose that enemy they had conspired to assist, and to preserve the Union they had combined to destroy. Known to its adversaries, and to them alone, it presents the curious anomaly of a plot without conspirators, and treason without an aim, republished at the end of twenty years, without additional proof, only to be contradicted and challenged anew.

In aid of this contradiction come the characters and situation of the accused. Deeply concerned in the continuance of a political system, upon which their pecuniary interests were largely dependent, of irreproachable lives and untarnished reputation, they are charged with an intention to prostrate their fame and their fortunes in renewing a degrading connection with a foreign power, whose oppression most of them might still remember, on the very soil which had witnessed the first blow towards its previous extinction. If there is any philosophy in the principles of evidence—if there is any truth in the fundamental axioms of morals, a charge involving so important a deviation from the ordinary theory of motive, should not rest upon vague presumptions, but upon the clearest and firmest proof; and particularly should this be so, when, as in the case of the Convention, the imputation goes farther, and involves the faith and honour of the great majority of the citizens of three ancient states. It is generally reserved for posterity to wonder at the inordinate credulity of party, and ours will find ample scope for the exercise of admiration, when they are told that their ancestors believed, without evidence, that whole commonwealths committed treason *secundum formam statuti*, and ticketed and labelled their best and worthiest citizens for mischief under the great seal of the republic.

We have thus briefly touched upon those considerations which have occurred to us as affecting the history of the Hartford Convention; and we here express our obligations to its author for the use which we have made of his facts and illus-

trations. We have endeavoured to exhibit the causes that led to the measure, the constitution of the Convention, its object, its proceedings and its result. We have answered, as we best might, the objections which from time to time have been raised against it, and attempted to show that they rest upon no solid foundation, either of evidence or argument. If we have failed in our effort to relieve the Convention from the imputations by which it has been assailed, the fault lies not with the cause; and our consolation is, that if we ourselves have not been enabled to exhibit truth in a convincing attitude, we shall have directed the attention of our readers to those points of view where their examination will be unimpeded by error. Hostile to no party in a by-gone contest, we crave for the injured one its legal right—a trial upon the merits; its moral right—a patient hearing; its constitutional right—a judgment according to evidence. If with these guarantees from injustice it is still condemned, though we may lament the issue of the cause, we shall not complain of the propriety of the sentence.

Mr. Dwight has taken occasion, in an appendix, to institute a short parallel between the Hartford Convention and a recent Convention in South Carolina, and we seize the opportunity he has afforded, to add a syllable in furtherance of our general argument. At a period when the high-minded citizens of the South are forgetting their local grievances, to throw themselves into the breach in defence of the constitution and the laws, we would not say one word to open old wounds or inflict new ones. But we may appeal to the ordinance of South Carolina, and to the laws of that state, enacted in pursuance of its provisions, and ask those who justify their adoption, whether the judgment they continue to pass upon their eastern brethren is wholly consistent? Admitting, to the full extent, the grievances of both, as exhibited by each,—which situation called for the promptest redress—which most earnestly demanded extraordinary remedies? South Carolina complained of oppressive, partial and unconstitutional legislation, affecting vital interests, and upheld by sectional feelings. New England complained likewise of a course of policy hostile to her pursuits, destructive of her prosperity, and striking directly at her existence. South Carolina remonstrated after the principle which she opposed had for years been acknowledged on the statute-book, had become incorporated with the policy of the government, the protecting shield of immense pecuniary interests, the sole dependence of thousands of industrious citizens. New England remonstrated from the first exercise of unconstitutional power, in 1803, through all her vicissitudes of evil and all her variety of suffering, down to the period when, at the end of eleven years, she craved of the national government the right to defend her

beggary. South Carolina rejected, in 1832, the very system which, in 1816, she had defended and enforced. The great charge against New England has been the unvarying consistency of her opposition to the policy which she censured. In vindication of a claim, comparatively of secondary importance, South Carolina, in a time of national tranquillity, threw her sword into the balance, nullified the laws of the Union, and, for the protection of her right, appealed to her sovereignty. At a period of alarm and invasion New England refused to withdraw her militia from the command of their constitutional officers; and, in defence of the lives and liberties of her citizens, pointed to the charter by which they were secured, peacefully demanding redress against its misconstruction. The South Carolina Convention virtually declared war against the Union; the New England Convention sought peace with it, and under it. Both demanded reparation and right, as secured by the fundamental law; both took unusual steps to obtain it; both alleged the purity of their purposes, and both have fallen under censure. We shall not decide between them, but history may hint, on reviewing their respective attitudes, that though arms and stern resolve did good service to freedom at Rome and Runnemede, modern judgments are more likely to be swayed by softer influences, and that modern taste, in reading the revolutionary motto,

“*Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem,*”

bestows the slightest emphasis upon its commencement.

One word in conclusion, and it shall be a brief one, for New England. Her history is before the country, and in it there are some pages that will not speedily be defaced, some names which cannot easily be forgotten. Her principles were graven on her rocks, when, in 1636, the Plymouth assembly declared that they would submit to “no act or imposition, present or to come, save such as should be enacted by the body of the people, or their representatives, legally assembled.”* They were deepened by the iron pen of the revolution, nor did she obliterate them when, in 1788, she investigated, with the most rigid and searching scrutiny, the provisions of the federal constitution. She held them fast in 1807, and during the long period of gloom which followed that eventful crisis. She held them fast when the war of 1812 added density to the preceding darkness; in 1832, when her most distinguished son defended the ramparts of the constitution from outward force; and she holds them fast in 1834, when the same gifted individual is guarding its citadel from internal treachery. Those principles are the grand fundamental maxims of civil liberty, the only true guarantee and safe-

* Bradford, vol. i. 269, note.

guard of the federal Union—authority and obedience according to the compact, constitutional resistance to usurped power, implicit submission to constitutional supremacy. Those are the principles which have survived both moral and physical suffering; which have sustained her under the distrust of her confederates and the assaults of her enemies; which in peace have baffled malice and misapprehension, and in war given indemnity and consolation for her ravaged plains, her captured citizens, and her burning villages—

“Quæ neque Dardaniis campis potuere perire,
Nec cum capta capi, nec cum combusta cremari.”

ART. VII.—*Private Correspondence of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford. Now first collected.* In four volumes, 8vo. London. 1820.

Memoirs of the Last Ten Years of the Reign of George the Second. By HORACE WALPOLE, Earl of Orford. *From the original MSS.* In two volumes, 4to. London. 1822.

Letters of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford, to Sir Horace Mann, British Envoy at the Court of Tuscany. Now first published from the Originals in the Possession of the Earl of Waldegrave. Edited by LORD DOVER. In two volumes. New York (reprinted). 1833.

To despise the good opinion of men is absurd. It is to throw away the highest external incentive to useful exertion. It is to live, as God never intended us to live, misanthropes or brutes. It is to deprive ourselves therefore of the harvest of our social actions. Yet, as unnatural and unmeaning as such a pretension must be considered, Horace Walpole affected to be influenced by it, and to have adopted it into his practical canons. He took every occasion to impress upon his correspondents how inane he esteemed the applause of his contemporaries and of posterity, of his own countrymen and of foreigners. Fame, he declared, was like an essence, the farther it is diffused the sooner it vanishes; and, as if by consequence, it was therefore to be contemned. But, let it be remembered, while he was thus zealous to inculcate upon the minds of his admirers this monstrous sentiment, he was diligently engaged in preparing for posterity fair and correct copies of some of his works, at least, which might arrest their attention and revive his name.

To this diligence we are indebted for the second and third of the works whose titles we have put at the head of this notice. The account of their seeing the light is thus given:

"Among the papers found at Strawberry Hill, after the death of Lord Orford, was the following memorandum, wrapped in an envelope, on which was written, '*Not to be opened till after wy will.*'"

"In my library at Strawberry Hill are two wainscot chests or boxes, the larger marked with an A. the lesser with a B:—I desire, that as soon as I am dead, my executor and executrix will cord up strongly and seal the larger box, marked A., and deliver it to the Honourable Hugh Conway Seymour, to be kept by him unopened and unsealed till the eldest son of lady Waldegrave, or whichever of her sons, being Earl of Waldegrave, shall attain the age of twenty-five years, when the said chest, with whatever it contains, shall be delivered to him as his own. And I beg that the Honourable Hugh Conway Seymour, when he shall receive the said chest, will give a promise in writing, signed by him, to lady Waldegrave, that he or his representatives will deliver the said chest, unopened and unsealed by my executor, and executrix to the first son of lady Waldegrave who shall attain the age of twenty-five years. The key of the said chest is in one of the cupboards of the green closet within the old breakfast-room at Strawberry Hill, and that key, I desire, may be delivered to Laura, lady Waldegrave, to be kept by her till her son shall receive the chest. March 21st, 1790. (Signed) Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford, Aug. 19th, 1796.'" *Preface to Memoirs*, pp. v. vi.

On opening the box, in pursuance of his wishes, a number of manuscript volumes and other papers, carefully prepared for publication, were found, and among them the works to which we have just alluded were discovered. Whence, it is naturally inquired, arises this inconsistency? The answer is gathered from his whole character; a character paradoxical and contradictory in every aspect in which it may be viewed, whether moral, political or literary. He appeared to be unambitious, yet few were more aspiring; he pretended to be a friend of all men, yet he was insincere and inconstant to all his personal intimates; he professed a noble generosity, yet he evinced strong prejudices and lasting animosities. In fact, he wore the mask completely; though more from folly than from evil. He was a whig but not a partizan; a politician but not an office-hunter. His mind might be thought an original one, but he was an imitator; he was possessed of a nice discernment, which gave birth to an infinity of *bon mots* and *polissonnerie*, but he was a bad critic. He saw all things from one point, and made his actions subservient to one ruling sentiment—a haughty self-conceit.

Although the administration of Sir Robert Walpole was unmarked by any strong foreign policy, it was one of factious turbulence. The English constitution was assuming, during that period, a distinct, though modified character; and parties which had been raised into existence by the political difficulties of a preceding age, were now, in the subsidence of the storm, thrown against each other in angry collision. Sir Robert de-

lighted in these collisions. He essayed to guide the state-vessel through tumults of passion and interest. The great storm hushed, he buoyed her, confident in his own strength, and despising ease. In this respect he was like Pitt, though unlike him in his policy and means of power. He wished to be the greatest man in England; Pitt desired to be the cynosure of Europe. He sought to make his country internally great and happy; Pitt aimed at making her mistress of the world. Walpole used a party to accomplish his purposes; Chatham used all Britain. Both were great statesmen; both more feared than loved. Historians will pass over the government of Walpole without notice; or, if they bestow upon it any attention, it will be to contrast its external quiet with the eventful period which soon ensued, and which plunged the English nation into an enormous war system, which the great resources and multiplied energies of its people only could support. His great influence over his sovereign, his active domestic policy, his party warfare, and his ambition, which, in the field that he had chosen for his efforts, was unlimited, placed him upon a dangerous elevation. He was successful in giving stability to the constitution, but his very success increased the hazard of his position. The jacobites were frantic with disappointment; the republican party were firm and determined in their opposition, and the more so that they had so careful, energetic, and severe an opponent. Where they assaulted, he intrigued; but his intrigues were a mine that finally destroyed his power. There were able and aspiring men opposed to him, who felt themselves strong enough to wield the government, and who aimed to fill his seat; they were the politicians who had grown up under his own tactics. It was plot and counterplot, as is ever the case in times of great national prosperity; for the intellect of the state being unnecessary in aiding its condition, narrow, selfish and interested views usurp the place which else would be supplied by a generous patriotism. Thus, from the active measures of the minister himself, from the necessary disquietude and uneasiness of the people while their government was changing some of its essential features, and from the intrigues and strifes which embittered party feelings generated, there arose much of that asperity and violence which it is the fashion of many in our own day, as it was of many at that time, to denounce as ominous of a decline of those political institutions under which they occur.

The son wisely deviated from the path pursued by the father. Violence in any extreme seldom fails to force the observant child into the opposite inquietude. Horace Walpole doubtless felt that the career of politics was too dangerous, and that its honours were too undesirable, too evanescent, to command his

attention, when his father had retired from it, poor, broken down and unlamented. But he must especially have regretted the practices of Sir Robert to acquire, retain and secure his power. A course of conduct or a trait of character which may be faulty, ever strikes those intimate with the individual more forcibly than it does strangers, and excites in their bosoms a feeling which is akin to mortification. The pride of self is wounded, and the cause, rankling like a barbed arrow in the heart, is ever present to the mind. Imperfections in those for whom we have no particular concern, address themselves to our reason, and are little thought of, except when directly brought up for examination. This remark might explain, and we are not sure that such an explanation is unnecessary, the very opposite course which Horace Walpole pursued from that of his father. It may serve to clear up much of the mysticism and inconsistency which has attached itself to his character. He buried the talent, not from inadvertence but from choice, and yet sought the increase. He saw the rock upon which his father had endangered all his hopes; he knew the result which had left him completely powerless. The younger Walpole, therefore, entered not in the like troubled waters. He became a man of the world, a virtuoso, an author; not of Grub street, because he had his own printing press and compositor at Strawberry Hill; a reviler of the learned, a Cicerone to politicians, an anecdote-monger. While his fellow-members in the popular branch of Parliament were meditating party conflicts, national wars, and imposts, he was dreaming of de Sevigné, or inditing epistles replete with political scandal and licentious witticisms; while they were devising means to cut off the Stuart-boy, or to avert a French invasion, he was studying how to possess himself of a painting or a statue; while the ministers were writing despatches to governors and admirals, he was throwing off light incident for the Paris or Florence market; or, mayhap, while others were striving to build up fortunes and power, he was diligently engaged in planning a new tower for his miniature gothic castle. So antipodistic was he in his line of conduct and habitudes to his great progenitor:

“Oh, Old Sir Robert, father, on my knee
I give Heaven thanks I was not like to thee.”

He wished to be known, yet he dreaded the means and consequences of notoriety. Despite of his general manners and of repeated asseverations to the contrary, he did aspire to be the chief of his own select circle,—the admired of a few admirers. He would have belied the adage that the children of heroes are fools; and he seems to have sought to impress a favourable idea of his own talents upon a discerning few, as a connecting link

between himself and posterity. This is peculiarly applicable to the latter part of his life, when the love of existence had shot its roots deep into the heart. His whole conduct presents the singular phenomenon of a struggle between the desire of a particular character among men, and the fear of being considered solicitous in regard to it. He stands almost alone in the annals of English politics and English literature as one who possessed the means in regard to the former, and the capability as to the other, of being of the most illustrious, but who threw away his advantages and misused his powers out of mere caprice or mistaken judgment.

The political history of England, from the time that Horace Walpole took his seat in Parliament, 1741—2, until Mr. Pitt was placed at the head of the ministry, presents one continued series of intrigues for office, and secret movements for personal ends. Acting as if of one party—having ostensibly in view the same leading principles—or, at all events, being secure from any opposition from so lofty and important a source as the vindication of great constitutional opinions, the politicians of this period contributed little to the advancement of the public weal. We read with astonishment the letters of these men. They seem to have fancied that government was instituted for their emolument—that the people were ciphers, or, more truly perhaps, automata—and that the change of sentiment for the advantage of place, was honourable, or at least not dishonourable. Lord Granville, a man of considerable talent and of strong passion, and who was placed at the head of the administration soon after the fall of Walpole, was one of the most supple creatures who ever pandered to the prejudices of a sovereign, or who succumbed to the baseness of ambition. His name frequently occurs in the letters of Horace Walpole, who, with all his personal reasons of enmity towards him, treats him with great lenity. This minister afforded a perfect specimen of *non-committalism*. He united with no particular party; attached himself to no principles, except to lift himself into power. When thus elevated, he discarded both friends and professions, and ingratiated himself with George II. by flattering his Hanoverian partialities. At one time he was a Jacobite; at another the fast friend of the German succession. He combined to pull down Sir Robert Walpole, and subsequently to restore him to power. The Pelhams, more artful than Granville, were not more honest. Their chicanery has become proverbial. They sacrificed principle at the political shrine; though the first, at least, did some service to the state. The other, the Duke of Newcastle, was a man of much less abilities and of as much ambition. He possessed one merit, and but one, as a minister. He was firm and resolute. The

unexpected death of his brother presented a most favourable opportunity, which he did not fail to improve, of seizing the reins of government. The means to which he resorted were of a kind with those which had been used by his predecessors, and extorted a striking reflection from our author.

“How avowed (says he) was become the traffic for Parliaments! how extensive the breach of the constitution, since Pym and Hampden presented their bosoms to cover and close the gap! Yet what has befallen this country, but what is common to sublunary establishments? How few years had rolled away between the age of Cato's, Brutus's, Cicero's, and the domination of that imperial fiddler Nero? Within how small a period did the stockjobber, Julianus, purchase the very empire which Trajan had extended to its utmost limits? The auction of votes is become an established commerce, and his grace did nothing but squabble for the prerogative of being sole appraiser.”

The public barter thus alluded to by the writer, was not more shamelessly pursued, than the system of private gratifications, out of the secret fund, to members of Parliament.

Politically corrupt and unsound as was this age, and ignoble and pitiable as was the conduct of those who had the sway of the British empire, there were men then sharing power who were destined to elevate the character of its statesmen and to redeem its honour. Murray, more generally known by his title of Lord Mansfield, possessed an intellect of the finest order. Brilliant yet clear, eloquent yet strongly argumentative, he applied himself to nothing which he did not adorn. Had his ambition been directed to the honours of political power rather than to those of his profession, he would doubtless have overcome, most triumphantly, the empty though strong prejudices of those who fancied that nothing of sterling worth and patriotism could come out of Scotland, and he would have run a career equally honourable to himself and serviceable to the country. As it was, his efforts in the House of Commons gave him an exalted character, which was still farther heightened by his legal decisions. If we look at our report books, we are astonished at the immense labour and research which he devoted to his favourite pursuit; and still more at the innumerable points of law which he elucidated and settled. The commercial interests of his country, which had then assumed a decisive superiority over every other, and which gave rise to many novel, important and embarrassing questions, opened a broad and almost untrodden field for the march of his great mind. He succeeded nobly; and although in some few instances his opinions have been since overruled, they remain for the most part unimpeached expositions of the principles of the common law, as applied to the new state of things which had grown up beyond its original contemplation. On the death of Mr. Pelham, he was looked up to by many to fill the vacant premier-

ship; but both Fox and Pitt, who were likewise desirous of the situation, filled a larger space in the public eye, and they united in keeping him down. Had he, however, been selected, he would doubtless have given more of character and interest to the political history of England for the succeeding years; though his services might have been forever and lamentably lost in that line in which, as we have said, they were so eminently valuable. Pitt, who at this period held the inferior office of paymaster, evinced an impatient spirit and desire to reach the seat which he saw filled in turn by men whose talents, if respectable, were nevertheless unsuited to the condition of the nation. My lord, said he to the Duke of Devonshire, just prior to his elevation, I am sure I can save this country, and nobody else can. It was a characteristic, though vainglorious boast, and one indeed that seemed subsequently to have been correct. We have already spoken of his ambition, which was a great element of his success. Like those by whom he was surrounded, he betrayed an inconsistency of conduct until he had possessed himself of the arm of power. Then he seemed to rely upon his own genius and upon his own political strength. He wielded the government with a strong and steady hand. His powers of mind were perhaps more dazzling than real, but they were sustained by a determination of purpose and an aspiration after fame, which more than compensated for any defect. Mansfield and Chatham were both fitted for severe governments. They exercised their respective powers arbitrarily so far as the opinions and rights of other men were concerned, though it must be confessed with considerable prudence and wisdom.

Horace Walpole possessed undoubted means of information, for the greater part of this period, in regard to the political movements of the parties in and out of power. His paternity in Sir Robert Walpole, and his intimacy with Mr. Fox, the Duke of Bedford and others of note, were so many direct and unerring sources. His pen gathered plentiful incident from them, which in turn gave a character and mode to his correspondence. We might naturally look in his letters for the secret intrigues of politicians, poignant sayings, personal anecdote, and all the piquancy and circumstance of the corruption in higher life.

Morals were at a low ebb. The public taste was most sadly perverted. The want of principle in official matters, extending itself into all the ramifications of society, had even loosened the bonds of the social system. We behold with astonishment the utter disregard with which the solemn obligations of marriage were viewed—of that institution which we are accustomed to look upon as divine—as well as the foundation of all order.

“Oppida cæperunt munire et ponere leges
Neu quis fur esset, neu quis latro, neu quis adulter.”

It is true, and it is but justice to declare, that at no other time was a greater regard shown to the rights of property, or were rights more jealously guarded than at this very period. How long it would have continued so, had not great causes of excitement supervened to divert the minds of those who took the lead and set the example, it does not require a great reach of prophecy to predict. The sores upon the body politic and social were external ulcerations, which, if unremedied, would have made their way into the very vitals of the whole system. Thus external, they gave a general discolouration to all those who came near the spheres of their influence. Walpole was too much a man of the world to take up arms against the peccadillos of his own circle; but he overlooks the moral remissness to entertain his correspondents with the history of the fact. Though a man of unimpeached habits in his own life, he never seems indignant at the dissoluteness of his age, nor does he expend any moral reflections upon it. He looks alike upon the good and the vicious, nor does the sun more impartially shine upon them.

Although he wrote much, his learning does not appear to have been equal to his wit; yet it was not so slender as he sometimes very capriciously asserts. His taste, his habits, and his disposition, led him into the light and venial, rarely into the abstruse, and never into the abstract. He knew men well, readily conceived their characters, and sketched them with spirit; but beyond this power of description he evinces no pre-eminence. Standing aloof from strong political connexions, he availed himself of his vantage ground to paint the externals of human nature. When he stoops from this elevation, to examine into the motives of men, he is prejudiced, incorrect and unjust. The pen which he at other times wields so successfully becomes partial and envenomed. His mind evinced strong poetical tendencies, and his course of reading seems to have nourished them. He furnishes us with an account, somewhat ludicrous, of his inability to apprehend the mathematical sciences.

“When I first went to Cambridge, (he writes to Sir Horace Mann,) I was to learn mathematics of the famous blind professor Sanderson. I had not frequented him a fortnight, before he said to me—‘Young man, it is cheating you to take your money; believe me, you never can learn these things; you have no capacity for them.’ I can smile now, but I cried then with mortification. The next step, in order to comfort myself, was not to believe him. I could not conceive that I had not talents for any thing in the world. I took, at my own expense, a private instructor, who came to me once a day for a year; nay, I took infinite pains, but had so little capacity and so little attention, (as I have always had to any thing that did not immediately strike my inclinations,) that, after mastering any proposition,

when the man came the next day, it was as new to me as if I had never heard of it; in short, even to common figures, I am the dullest dunce alive. I have often said it of myself, and it is true, that nothing that has not a proper name of a man or woman to it, affixes any idea upon my mind. I could remember who was King Ethelbald's great aunt, and not be sure whether she lived in the year 500 or 1500. I don't know whether I ever told you that when you sent me the seven gallons of drams, and they were carried to Mr. Fox, by mistake, for Florence wine, I pressed him to keep as much as he liked; for, said I, I have seen the bill of lading, and there is a vast quantity. He asked how much? I answered seventy gallons; so little idea have I of quantity."

We can readily understand, from this confession, how much more suited he was to be the chronicler of anecdotes than the expounder of doctrines. He had a high admiration for genius; but it was, as may be supposed, of an order akin to his own. The mind which sported with and subdued the light and evanescent, which evinced epigram and humour, which only grazed, though skilfully, over the realities of creation, presented to his own, affinities more congenial than did that which delved deeply for new truth, or which manifested philosophic power. He denounces the strong, expressive and thought-inspiring language of Johnson as absurd bombast, and describes Goldsmith as a silly changeling, though he admits that he had bright gleams of parts. The judgments so dogmatically passed by our Aristarchus in these two cases, are not more ridiculous than that which he awarded against Hume. Although in his correspondence with the philosopher he pays him great respect for his learning, and flatters him for his good sense, yet he writes to Governor Pownall, that he considered Hume a superficial mountebank, who mounted a system in the garb of a philosophic empiric, but dispensed no drugs but what he was authorized to vend by royal patent. Pope was the only one of his contemporaries of whom he seems to have conceived a just character. Gray, with whom at different times he had been upon terms of personal friendship and enmity, he admired for his *humour*. Indeed his literary criticisms, especially upon his own times, bear the marks either of gross ignorance, or of an unaccountable perversion of taste or of judgment. We cannot attribute to him the former, for he everywhere manifests a familiar acquaintance with the literature if not science of the day. We may believe it to be the latter when we observe a strange inconsistency in many of his acts, produced by mere whim or personal vanity.

His own writings are not so popular now as they formerly were; nor do they, in the main, demand from us any lengthened notice. His poetical fragments do not assuredly convey any great idea of his powers. They belong to a school of English verse which has long since been condemned; and

which in truth possesses no merit beyond the point and prettiness of epigram and conceit. His prose works take a higher rank. Some of his compositions, such as the *Anecdotes of Painting*, evince in a peculiar degree the felicitous manner in which an inelaborate history may be written, and by which a barren subject can be rendered most interesting. The *Castle of Otranto*, one of the best of our romances, is entitled to the pre-eminence which it sustains, and which it must continue to hold as long as public taste continues to refine itself upon feudal models. This work, founded on a dream, or perhaps more correctly on his strong partiality in favour of the gothic, which led his fantasied brain to imagine castles and a "gigantic hand in armour," is, as might be well supposed, *sui generis*. The natural of modern romances had almost entirely displaced the marvellous, and the novels of Richardson had drawn the public taste to the highest sustainable point. "I thought," said he, in a letter to the husband of Madame de Beaumont, "the *nodus* was become *dignus vindice*, and that a god, at least a ghost, was necessary to frighten us out of too much senses." The path which he struck out has been successfully travelled by Lewis, Mrs. Radcliffe and others, the popularity of whose works is chiefly owing to the character which they have borrowed from the *Castle of Otranto*. What veteran novel reader does not remember, although years may have elapsed since the perusal of this work, the peculiar sensations which it awakened, and what a broad and interesting field it opened to his youthful imagination! We may not yield to it the extravagant praise which Byron has earnestly awarded; but we may consider it as the first of that class of novels to which it belongs.

But whatever opinion may be formed of his other remains, there will be but one as to his correspondence. His turn of mind suited this species of writing. It was acute, not profound. He detected the relations of things. He saw points of distinction and observed affinities, where others would have passed over both unobserved. He was a perfect master of appearances—the *tout-ensemble*, and the particulars. Here he stopped. He could describe but not philosophise. He saw each heaving of the agitated bosom, but he penetrated not the sanctuary of the heart to observe what was passing there. He possessed, therefore, one great element of a letter-writer—we mean of one who writes to amuse. Yet as if not confident in his own powers, he appears at times to be nothing but a servile imitator. His letters betray great effort—something more than an off-hand and ready attempt. They are stiff and compressed, and the reader is haunted with the idea that something more was intended by the author than to inform or entertain his correspondent. They appear as if written for the public

eye rather than for the private friend. It is one of the anomalies which present themselves at every step we take to learn his character. Mayhap, in the very letter which we would cite for an illustration of our position, we might fall upon an anathema against learning, fame or glory; and yet we cannot divest ourselves of the belief, that he was not indifferent to the latter, and would not, in truth, be thought unpossessed of the former. His wit, however, is not the less wit because it is polished, nor are his descriptions the less interesting because they are elaborate. We read and continue to read a whole letter, and a number of letters, when, were it not for the fascinating influence that they exert, we had dropped the book to attend our neglected concerns. Beyond almost any other writer within our remembrance, not excepting Lady Montague, he has the merit of making matters, insignificant in themselves, of sufficient moment to awaken our curiosity to an unlimited degree. Like the enchanter in the Eastern fable, he transports us whither he pleases; and, although we may be reluctant to proceed, we find, when we have reached our destination, that we have been amply rewarded.

There is another point of view from which we must look at the letters of Walpole. We have already referred to his extreme vanity. Here we find it developed in its full force and effect. He attempts to give a tone to opinion. He speaks as if discarding the voice of authority, and relying upon his own understanding. To give a law to taste, to establish a canon for criticism, to put forth a principle in practice, are with him matters of ordinary moment and frequent occurrence. He was a liberal and an innovator in every thing. He found fault with the ministry, he reviled learned men, and he ridiculed every one but Marshal Conway. He was of that unhappy class of beings who detect imperfections, take great credit for pointing them out to the world, but who never propose a remedy. His sentiments in regard to our war with the mother country for independence, were doubtless adverse to the ministry, but they were not, so far as we can gather from his writings, very favourable to us. "From its very commencement," says Lord Dover, "he objected to that disastrous contest, the American war, which commenced in ignorant and presumptuous folly, was prolonged to gratify the wicked obstinacy of individuals, and ended, as Walpole foretold it would, in the discomfiture of its authors, and the national disgrace and degradation, after a profuse and useless waste of blood and treasure." The objection here referred to did not arise from any sympathy for this people, or from a great interest in our cause, but from his constitutional right, which it is said every Englishman possesses, to murmur against the individuals in power. He condemns the

war—that it was unjust? No. That it was an attempt of the administration to coerce the colonies into an acquiescence under unconstitutional authority? Not at all. He finds fault with it because it was expensive—because the game, in common phrase, was not worth the candle. He opposed the government on the least tenable of the grounds upon which it might be resisted. This trait in his character, of overbearing opinion, is illustrated in his quarrels with his best friends. The editor of the two volumes, placed last at the head of this article, furnishes us with the following—

“Gray had been a school-friend of Walpole. As has been before mentioned, they travelled together, and quarrelled during the journey. Walter Scott suggests as a reason for their differences, that the youthful vivacity, and perhaps aristocratic assumption of Walpole, did not agree with the somewhat formal opinions and habits of the professed man of letters. This conjecture may very possibly be the correct one; but we have no clue to guide us with certainty to the causes of their rupture. In after life they were reconciled, though the intimacy of early friendship never appears to have been restored between them. Scott says of Walpole, that his temper was precarious—and we may perhaps affirm the same of Gray. At all events, they were persons of such different characters, that their not agreeing could not be surprising. What could be more opposite than ‘the self-sequestered, melancholy Gray,’ and the eager, volatile Walpole, of whom Lady Townshend said, when some one talked of his good spirits—‘Oh! Mr. Walpole is spirits of hartshorn.’ When Mason was writing the *Life of Gray*, Walpole bade him throw the whole blame of the quarrel upon him. This might be merely magnanimity, as Gray was then dead; what makes one most inclined to think it is the truth, is the fact, that Gray was not the only intimate friend of Walpole with whom he (Walpole) quarrelled. He did so with Bentley, for which the eccentric conduct of that man of talent might perhaps account. But what shall we say to his quarrel with the good-humoured, laughing George Montague; with whom, for the last years of the life of the latter, he held no intercourse? It is true that, in a letter to Mr. Cole, Walpole lays the blame upon Montague, and says ‘he was become such an humourist;’ but, it must be remembered, that we do not know Montague’s version of the story; and that, undoubtedly, three quarrels with three intimate friends, rather support the charge brought by Scott against Walpole, of his having ‘a precarious temper.’”

It is but an act of justice, after giving the above, to subjoin the testimony of Lord Dover, in regard to a distinguished instance of Walpole’s constancy in friendship.

“The friendship, however, which does honour both to the head and heart of Horace Walpole, was that which he bore to Marshal Conway; a man, who, according to all the accounts of him that have come down to us, was so truly worthy of inspiring such a degree of affection. Burke’s panegyric upon his public character and conduct is well known; while the editor of Lord Orford’s works thus most justly eulogises his private life: ‘It is only those who have had the opportunity of penetrating into the most secret motives of his public conduct, and the inmost recesses of his private life, that can do real justice to the unsullied purity of his character—who saw and knew him in the evening of his days, retired from the honourable activity of a soldier and statesman, to the calm enjoyments of private life, happy in the resources of his own mind, and in the cultivation of useful

science, in the bosom of domestic peace—unenriched by pensions or places, undistinguished by titles or ribands, unsophisticated by public love and unwearied by retirement.' The offer of Walpole to share his fortune with Conway, when the latter was dismissed from his places, an offer so creditable to both parties, has been already mentioned; and if we wish to have a just idea of the esteem in which Marshal Conway was held by his contemporaries, it is only necessary to mention, that upon the same occasion similar offers were pressed upon him by his brother, Lord Hertford, and by the Duke of Devonshire, without any concert between them."

Neither was this a solitary instance of magnanimity on the part of Walpole. He made the same offer of sharing his fortune with Madame du Deffand, when her pension was greatly curtailed by the financial operation of Terrai. It evinces the strength of his feeling; but it seems to have been rather the impulse of the moment, than the result of a long-continued and heartfelt attachment.

We shall devote the remainder of this article to a review of the letters to Sir Horace Mann. Lord Dover claims for this correspondence of Horace Walpole the character of the most interesting that *has yet appeared*, as they are his only letters which give any account of the 'curious period' when his father was compelled to yield up his power. Although they do fill up the gap of a period of eight years, commencing about the time that the writer took his seat in parliament, they cannot (we mean that portion filling up this interval, which is the smaller part of the time occupied in the correspondence) be considered, independently of the factitious interest which the bare fact of their making the series uninterrupted may create, of any great value. They are the most barren part of the two volumes, with the single exception of those referring to the attempt of the young Stuart in 1745. Horace Mann was an early friend of Walpole, and had been appointed, a short time before the letters commence, English minister to the court of Florence, which situation he held for the period of forty-six years. The terms of intimacy which subsisted between the two friends, the great facilities of information which Walpole possessed, and the distant residence of Mann, led the former to relate every thing that took place, both 'in the court and in society, whether the anecdotes were of a public or a private nature.'

As our readers may obtain a better opinion of the epistolary character of Walpole from a few excerpts from these letters than from long extracts, which would render it necessary to subjoin the cumbrous and unimportant notes of Lord Dover, we shall throw together a few selected at random:—

"Oh! a story of Mr. Pope and the Prince:—'Mr. Pope, you don't love princes.' 'Sir, I beg your pardon.' 'Well, you don't love kings, then!' 'Sir, I own I love the lion best before his claws are grown.' Was it possible to make a better answer to such simple questions?"

"Do you love puns? A pretty man of the age came into the playhouse the other night booted and spurred: says he, 'I am come to see Orpheus'—'and Euridice—you rid I see,' replied another gentleman."

"There is nothing so whimsical as modern honour! You may debauch a woman upon promise of marriage, and not marry her; you may ruin your tailor's or baker's family by not paying them; you may make Mr. Mann maintain you for eighteen months, as a public minister, out of his own pocket, and still be a man of honour! But not to pay a common sharper, or not to murder a man who has trod upon your toe, is such a blot in your scutcheon, that you could never recover your honour, though you had in your veins all the blood of all the Howards."

"Would you know why I like London so much? Why, if the world must consist of so many fools as it does, I choose to take them in the gross, and not made into separate pills, as they are prepared in the country. Besides, there is no being alone but in a metropolis: the worst place in the world to find solitude is the country: questions grow there, and that unpleasant Christian commodity, neighbours. Oh! they are all good Samaritans, and do so pour balms and nostrums upon one, if one has but the toothache, or a journey to take, that they break one's head—a journey to take—aye, they talk over the miles to you and tell you you will be late in."

"I should love my country exceedingly, were it not for my countrymen."

"We are now mad about tar-water, on the publication of a book that I will send you written by Dr. Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne. The book contains every subject from tar-water to the Trinity; however, all the women read, and understand it no more than they would if it were intelligible. A man came into an apothecary's shop the other day, 'Do you sell tar-water?' 'Tar-water,' replied the apothecary, 'why I sell nothing else.'"

"Here am I,' as Lord Cornbury says, 'sitting for a borough, while every body else stands for one.' He diverted me extremely the other day with the application of a story to the king's speech. It says, the reason for dissolving the Parliament, is its being so near dissolution. [Something like Secretary Taney's reason for changing the depository of the public funds from the United States Bank]. Lord Cornbury said it put him in mind of a jailor in Oxfordshire, who was remarkably humane to his prisoners; one day he said to one of them, 'My good friend, you know you are to be hanged on Friday se'ennight; I want extremely to go to London; would you be so kind as to be hanged next Friday?'"

"Hogarth has run a great risk since the peace; he went to France, and was so imprudent as to be taking a sketch of the drawbridge at Calais. He was seized and carried to the governor, where he was forced to prove his vocation by producing several *caricatures* of the French; particularly a scene of the shore, with an immense piece of beef landing for the Lion d'argent (the English inn at Calais), and several hungry friars following it. They were much diverted with his drawings and dismissed him."

"My Lord Bolingbroke has lost his wife. When she was dying, he acted grief; flung himself upon her bed, and asked her if she could forgive him. I never saw her, but have heard her wit and parts excessively commended. Dr. Middleton told me a compliment she made him two years ago, which I thought pretty. She said she was persuaded that he was a very great writer, for she understood his works better than any other English book, and that she had observed that the best writers were always the most intelligible."

"As I am in town, and not within the circle of Pope's walks, I may tell you a story without fearing he should haunt me with the ghost of a satire. I went the other day to see little Spence, who fondles an old

mother in imitation of Pope. The good old woman was mighty civil to me, and among other chat, said, she supposed I had a good neighbour in Mr. Pope. 'Lord, madam, he has been dead these seven years!' 'Alas! aye, sir, I had forgot.' When the poor old soul dies, how Pope will set his mother's spectre upon her, for daring to be ignorant 'if Dennis be alive or dead.'"

His prejudices against the Scotch evince themselves in all his writings, and we find not a few instances in these letters.

"I must tell you a good piece of discretion of a Scotch soldier, whom Mr. Selwyn met on Bexley heath, walking back to the army. He had met with a single glove at Hingham, which had been left there last year in an inn by an officer now in Flanders: this the fellow was carrying in hopes of a little money; but for fear he should lose the glove, wore it all the way."

Among the earlier letters to Mr. Mann we find the following, which furnishes an insight into that character which he assumed, of disregarding the opinion of men. It also hints at the fact that he was treated with much coldness by his father, towards whom, however, he ever manifests the most tender regards, and under circumstances, at times, of the most trying character. Indeed, it should be remembered to his honour, that however trifling and indifferent he might have been oftentimes in matters of serious moment, filial piety was a virtue which shone bright in his scutcheon. The reason of Sir Robert's treatment does not appear, unless it be traced to that subversion of affection which a laxity in private morals and private conduct often produces.

"I must answer for your brother a paragraph that he showed me in one of your letters: *Mr. W.'s letters are full of wit; don't they adore him in England?* Not at all—and I don't wonder at them; for if I have any wit in my letters, which I do not at all take for granted, it is ten to one that I have none out of my letters. A thousand people can write that cannot talk; and besides, you know, (or I conclude so, from the little one hears stirring,) that numbers of the English have wit, who don't care to produce it. Then, as to adoring; you now see only my letters, and you may be sure I take care not to write you one word about any of my bad qualities, which other people must see in the gross; and that may be a great hindrance to their adoration. Oh! there are a thousand other reasons I could give you, why I am not the least in fashion. I came over in an ill season; it is a million to one that nobody thinks a declining old minister's son has wit. At any time men in opposition have always most; but now it would be absurd for a courtier to have even common sense. There is not a Mr. Sturt, or a Mr. Stuart, whose names begin with the first letters of Stanhope* that has not a better chance than I for being liked. I can assure you, even those of the same party would be fools not to pretend to think me one. Sir Robert has showed no partiality for me; and do you think they would commend where he does not? even supposing they had no envy, which, by-the-way, I am far from saying they have not. Then, my dear child, I am the coolest man of my party, and if I am ever warm, it is by

* Lord Chesterfield.

contagion; and where violence passes for parts, what will indifference be called? But how could you think of such a question? I don't want money, consequently no old women pay me or my wit; I have a very flimsy constitution, consequently the young women won't taste my wit, and it is a long while before wit makes its own way in the world; especially as I never prove it, by assuring people that I have it by me. Indeed if I were disposed to brag, I could quote two or three half-pay officers, and an old aunt or two, who laugh prodigiously at every thing I say; but till they are allowed judges I will not brag of such authorities."

The landing of the young pretender in the summer of 1745, and his subsequent operations, as well also the tragical scenes which terminated that vain effort, afforded an abundant theme for the exercise of Walpole's pen. We look upon the measures of the English government to resist this attempt with perfect astonishment. Whether the administration contemned the jacobite influence, or looked upon the boy's army as too insignificant to demand the calling forth of their resources, certain it is that they were unprepared for the attempt. There is hardly a parallel to be found in the history of modern Europe of an inexperienced commander, with a handful of undisciplined men, advancing so far into the heart of such a strong and populous country as England, without receiving a check. The whole matter evinced how much the ministry was deficient in energy and capacity. The battle of Prestow Pans first opened their eyes to the necessity of some decided exertion; that of Falkirk taught them that a determined purpose may sometimes be very nearly accomplished by slender means. In truth, while the government was engaged in a double contest, a war on the continent and a rebellion at home, individuals were engaged in intrigues and bickerings for their personal promotion. In February 1746, and not in August of the same year, as Lord Dover has unaccountably stated it to have been, and in the midst of the rebellion, the ministry went to the king and threatened to tender their resignations unless he would receive Mr. Pitt into office, and in fact did give up their offices. Lord Granville and Lord Bath, both men of inferior minds for the high offices they held, though of some genius, attempted to form an administration. They tried the House of Commons, "and found it would not do."

"Bounce, (says our author,) went all the project into shivers, like the vessels in Ben Jonson's *Alchymist*, when they are on the brink of the philosopher's stone—the poor king, who, from being fatigued with the Duke of Newcastle, and sick of Pelham's timidity and compromises, had given into this mad hurly-burly of alterations, was confounded with having floundered to no purpose, and to find himself more than ever in the power of men he hated, shut himself up in his closet, and refused to admit any more of the persons, who were pouring in upon him with white sticks and golden keys, and commissions, &c.

The result of the whole was, that the king at last sent to

Pelham, desiring that they would all return to their offices. Pitt became paymaster. These scenes were not more ridiculous than the action of the government in regard to the army, which at this very time had caused a French farce, in which an English courier enters with two bunches of despatches fastened to his belly and his back, of the one of which he says, "*Ces sont mes ordres,*" and of the other, "*Mais elles sont mes contre-ordres.*" This vacillating conduct, both in civil and military affairs, gave courage to the pretender, and strengthened his cause. Flushed with his little success, and not less elevated by it in the opinion of that large body in the North who were inclined towards him and his family, he proceeded more boldly, and received into his ranks men of high birth, if not of fortune, who only waited for the prospect now presented to risk their lives and property in his attempt. The battle of Culloden, however, dissipated all the hopes of a throne for the Stuart family, and left in the power of the government as prisoners and rebels, not a few of those who had enrolled under its standard. The boy, as it is well known, most miraculously escaped after this most rash undertaking. Yet, as he himself declared, he had nothing to be ashamed of; for if he had lost one battle he had gained two.

Among the prisoners taken by the Duke of Newcastle, at the battle of Culloden, were the Lords Kilmarnock, Balmerino, and Cromarty, who were formally tried at Westminster Hall by their peers—the lords. "As it was the most interesting sight," says Walpole, "it was the most splendid and fine; a coronation is a puppet-show, and all the splendour of it idle; but this sight at once feasted one's eyes and engaged all one's passions." One hundred and thirty-nine lords were present; and over whom the chancellor, Lord Hardwicke, presided. Kilmarnock had four earldoms in him, but he was so poor that he often wanted a dinner. He possessed an extremely fine person, and a fine voice, which together with his manly bearing at the trial, created much sympathy for him, in view of which Dr. Johnson says,

"Pitied by gentle minds, Kilmarnock died."

He and Lord Cromartie, who appears to have been a man of much less courage, plead guilty. Balmerino possessed an intrepidity almost senseless. While the lords were deliberating on his case, the solicitor-general, Murray, afterwards Lord Mansfield, went to Balmerino and asked him how he could have given the lords so much trouble, after his own solicitor had told him that his plea could not avail him. The prisoner, having inquired of those by him who the solicitor-general was, said, "Oh! Mr. Murray! I am extremely glad to see you; I have

been with several of your relations; the good lady, your mother, was of great use to us at Perth." The peers severally declared him guilty. Walpole complains very much of the conduct of Lord Hardwicke towards the prisoners, and that instead of "keeping up to the humane dignity of the law of England, whose character it is to point out favour to the criminal, he crossed them, and almost scolded at any offer they made towards defence." Lord Cromartie was reprieved at the intercession of the Prince of Wales; but the other two were condemned to the block. Walpole gives the following account of the execution, derived from two eye-witnesses, and from another who was on the scaffold. It affords a good specimen of the author's descriptive style:—

"Just before they came out of the tower, Lord Balmerino drank a bumper to King James's health. As the clock struck ten, they came forth on foot, Lord Kilmarnock all in black, his hair unpowdered in a bag, supported by Forster, the great Presbyterian, and by Mr. Home, a young clergyman, his friend. Lord Balmerino followed, alone, in a blue coat turned up with red, his rebellious regimentals, a flannel waistcoat, and his shroud beneath; their hearses following. They were conducted to a house near the scaffold; the room forwards had benches for spectators; in the second, Lord Kilmarnock was put, and in the third, backwards, Lord Balmerino; all three chambers hung with black. Here they parted! Balmerino embraced the other, and said—'My Lord, I wish I could suffer for both!' He had scarce left him before he desired again to see him, and then asked him, 'My Lord Kilmarnock, do you know any thing of the resolution taken in our army, the day before the battle of Culloden, to put the English prisoners to death?' He replied—'My Lord, I was not present; but, since I came hither, I have had all the reason in the world to believe that there was such order taken; and I hear the duke has the pocket-book with the order.' Balmerino answered—'It was a lie raised to excuse their barbarity to us.' Take notice, that the duke's charging this on Lord Kilmarnock (certainly on misinformation), decided this unhappy man's fate! The most now pretended is, that it would have come to Lord Kilmarnock's turn to have given the word for the slaughter, as lieutenant-general, with the patent for which he was immediately drawn into the rebellion, after having been staggered by his wife, her mother, his own poverty, and the defeat of Cope. He remained an hour and a half at the house, and shed tears. At last he came to the scaffold, certainly much terrified, but with a resolution that prevented his behaving in the least meanly or unlike a gentleman. He took no notice of the crowd, only to desire that the baize might be lifted up from the rails, that the mob might see the spectacle. He stood and prayed some time with Forster, who wept over him, exhorted and encouraged him. He delivered a long speech to the sheriff, and with a noble manliness stuck to the recantation he had made at his trial: declaring he wished that all who embarked in the same cause might meet the same fate. He then took off his bag, coat and waistcoat, with great composure; and, after some trouble, put on a napkin, cap, and then, several times, tried the block; the executioner, who was in white, with a white apron, out of tenderness concealing the axe, which was behind himself. At last the earl knelt down, with a visible unwillingness to depart, and after five minutes dropped his handkerchief, the signal, and his head was cut off at once, only hanging by a bit of skin, and was received in a scarlet cloth by four of the undertaker's men, kneeling, who wrapped it up and put it

into the coffin with the body; orders having been given not to expose the heads, as used to be the custom.

"The scaffold was immediately new strewed with saw-dust, the block new covered, the executioner new dressed, and a new axe brought. Then came old Balmerino, treading with the air of a general. As soon as he mounted the scaffold, he read the inscription on his coffin, as he did again afterwards; he then surveyed the spectators, who were, in amazing numbers, even upon masts of ships in the river; and, pulling out his spectacles, read a treasonable speech, which he delivered to the sheriff, and said, the young pretender was so sweet a prince, that flesh and blood could not resist following him; and lying down, to try the block, he said, 'If I had a thousand lives, I would lay them down in the same cause.' He said, if he had not taken the sacrament the day before, he would have knocked down Williamson, the lieutenant of the tower, for his ill usage of him. He took the axe and felt it, and asked the headsman how many blows he had given Lord Kilmarnock, and gave him three guineas. Two clergymen, who attended him, coming up, he said, 'No, gentlemen, you have done me all the service you can.' Then he went to the corner of the scaffold, and called very loud to the warder, to give him his perriwig, which he took off, and put on a night-cap of Scotch plaid, and then pulled off his coat and waistcoat and lay down; but being told he was on the wrong side, vaulted round, and immediately gave the sign by tossing up his arm, as if he were giving the signal for battle. He received three blows; but the first certainly took away all sensation. He was not a quarter of an hour on the scaffold; Lord Kilmarnock above half an one. Balmerino certainly died with the intrepidity of a hero, but with the insensibility of one too. As he walked from his prison to execution, seeing every window and top of house filled with spectators, he cried out, 'Look, look, how they are all piled up like rotten oranges.'"

Thus closed the rebellion, if indeed it may be so called, of 1745. The hopes of the Stuarts were forever extinguished, unless, mayhap, at some future day, in the failure of Hanoverian blood, or in some violent political convulsion, some obscure scion of this forgotten race be brought forward to supply the chain of English kings with a legitimate link. With this extinction, however, the Georges fixed themselves more firmly upon the throne, and the government received more stability. Jacobite influence, it is true, at times showed its front, but even that interest soon became lost in the more formidable parties which arose to dispute the ascendancy in the administration of the country. The almost bloodless revolution which England thus underwent, speaks volumes for the strength of its constitution, and redounds greatly to the credit of the people. A change truly had come over the land since the feuds of York and Lancaster had imbued the hands of brothers in fraternal blood. The great and really paramount estate—the people—were then the scape-goats of unholy ambition and aristocratic quarrels; they had been lost in the comparatively unimportant struggles for power of two families. They were now in a measure redeemed; they knew it was not so great a matter to them who reigned, when they were not to be specially

benefited by the arrogance of the Stuarts or by the stupidity of those of Brunswick.

Walpole seems to have entertained most philanthropic views in regard to the trade in slaves from Africa. Although the government was actually employed in fortifying and securing more effectually the rights, or rather the immunities of the African company—and were devising means to flood this country with the products of the inhuman traffic, our author rose above the mist of interest which seemed to have enveloped the whole nation, and entered his protest, with a few others, against the whole transaction. Speaking of the measure, as contemplating methods to make more effectual the traffic of selling negroes, and on which the House of Commons had been sitting for a fortnight, "I would not," he declares, "have to say that I voted in it for the continent of America! The destruction of the miserable inhabitants by the Spaniards, was but a momentary misfortune, that flowed from the discovery of the new world, compared to this lasting havoc which is brought upon Africa." And again, referring to *L'Esprit des Loix*, he says, "I despise your literati enormously for their opinion of Montesquieu's book. Bid them read that glorious chapter on the selling of African slaves. Where did he borrow that? In what book in the world is there half so much wit, sentiment, delicacy, humanity?" These opinions were honourable to the head and heart of Walpole. They are the sentiments, we must believe, of the British people and of that government now. No stinted praise shall be meted out by us for the noble stand they have taken in the cause of humanity—of life and liberty. But we must defend ourselves, our country, against the ungenerous imputations, nay, the rank injustice with which the British periodical press teems, and which every orator and speech-maker in Parliament utter against this country. The very act of their own legislature, at the time to which we are now referring, was riveting the more firmly African bondage in the colonies, now the United States. It was the policy, nay, the selfishness, of their own government, which fixed the curse upon us, and infused into the very life-blood of our being, that slavery which they condemn in us. England is now reaping the rewards of the traffic, and hundreds and thousands of her citizens are rolling in the ill-gotten wealth of this trade. The people of the United States are struggling, through the exertions of the wise and good, to alleviate the evil; and northman and southerner, all are animated by the one principle of correcting it, consistently with our own safety—of placing ourselves in the condition which we should have enjoyed had it not been for the *auri sacra fames* of English slave-dealers. Can any

thing be more unjust than to throw into our faces a custom—an institution if it please them, which, originating in their own cupidity, and continued by their own state policy, has become so fixed and established among us as to admit of no corrective but what time and gradual effort may afford?

The extreme ignorance of the mother country in regard to the necessities and wants of its American dependencies, is not only shown in its earlier measures, but was evinced in almost every instance of legislation upon the affairs connected with this country. The secretaries of state and the board of trade, although entrusted peculiarly with these concerns, were culpably remiss in a knowledge of their business. Temporary expedients were resorted to for the purpose of avoiding present difficulties; and when, in the chance of legislation or negotiation, advantages were secured to America, or its safety from aggression was effected, the very next step, perhaps, deprived it of all. Letters for instruction from the governors of the colonies, petitions of redress or of assistance, papers, in fact, of all kinds were suffered to lie in the honourable secretary's office unopened, and their contents unknown. It would hardly be expected that he could become acquainted with the affairs of his charge under such circumstances. Yet it was scandalous that such a want of geographical knowledge even, should have been found in the Duke of New-Castle, at a crisis so important as that preceding and at the time of the old French war, as was evinced by him on the occasion of General Legonier's speaking of the defence of Annapolis. 'Annapolis, Annapolis!' said he, in reply, 'oh! yes, Annapolis must be defended; to be sure Annapolis should be defended—*where is Annapolis?*' On the contrary, the French government were using every means to possess themselves of colonial information, and especially in relation to our condition. They saw the immense advantage that a chain of possessions, from the Canadas on the north to the Mississippi on the southwest, would be to them; and while they perceived this, they took the proper steps to effect the end. The war found us unprepared, the government unadvised. The latter, it is true, at length awoke to our situation; but, how much of the blood that was spilled and of the woe which was produced, subsequently, is to be attributed to the incapacity of ministers and the negligence of government? The lesson, however, was not lost upon our ancestors.

The first engagement at Great Meadows, in which Washington first appeared as a military character, at least in a superior capacity, is noted by Horace Walpole in his accustomed style of levity. It is certainly surprising that, after having taken so much pains to prepare his works for posterity, the author of the letters should have left such a passage as the following,

he having seen the subsequent career of our distinguished countryman. "The French," says he, "have tied up the hands of an excellent *fanfaron*, a Major Washington." Now, if there is any thing in the character of Washington which entitles him to admiration over other military commanders, it is the absence of any thing like an overbearing dictation. The charge is repeated more offensively in the *Memoires*, in which the author writes: "In the express which Major Washington wrote on his preceding little victory, he concluded with these words:—*I heard the bullets whistle, and believe me, there is something charming in the sound.* On hearing of this letter, the king said sensibly, *He would not say so, if he had been used to hear many.* However, this brave *braggart* learned to blush for his rodomontade, and desiring to serve General Braddock, as aid-de-camp, acquitted himself nobly." These are among the chronicles for which Horace Walpole expected to receive the "thanks of posterity."

Of this man, under whom Washington is represented as having been desirous to serve, we have a description which portrays him in a very objectionable light, and which shows how unworthy he was of the high regards thus declared to have been paid him, and how remiss were the ministry in employing him. All accounts unite in declaring him to have been a brave man; but bravery is not the only qualification of a commander. The following private reminiscences place his character in no pleasing point of view:

"But don't you begin to be impatient for the events of all our West Indian expeditions? The duke (of Cumberland) who is now the soul of the regency, and who on all hands is allowed to make a great figure there, is much dissatisfied at the slowness of General Braddock, who does not march as if he was at all impatient to be scalped. It is said for him, that he has had bad guides, that the roads are exceedingly difficult, and that it was necessary to drag as much artillery as he does. This is not the first time, as witness in Hawley, that the duke has found that brutality did not necessarily consummate a general. I love to give you an idea of our characters as they rise upon the stage of history. Braddock is a very Iroquois in disposition. He had a sister who, having gamed away all her little fortune at Bath, hanged herself with a truly English deliberation, leaving only a note upon the table, with those lines, 'To die is landing on some silent shore, &c.' When Braddock was told of it, he only said, 'Poor Fanny! I always thought she would play till she was forced to *tuck herself up.*' But a more ridiculous story of him, and which is recorded in heroics by Fielding, in his Covent Garden tragedy, was an amorous discussion he had formerly with a Mrs. Upton, who kept him. He had gone the greatest length with her pin-money, and was still craving. One day that he was very pressing, she pulled out her purse, and showed him that she had but twelve or fourteen shillings left; he twitched it from her, 'Let me see that.' Tied up at the other end he found five guineas; he took them, tossed the empty purse in her face, saying, 'Did you mean to cheat me?' and never went near her more."

* * * * *

"I have already given you some account of Braddock; I may complete the poor man's history in a few words: he once had a duel with Colonel Gumley, Lady Bath's brother, who had been his great friend: as they were going to engage, Gumley, who had good humour and wit (Braddock had the latter), said, 'Braddock, you are a poor dog! here, take my purse; if you kill me, you will be forced to run away, and then you will not have a shilling to support you.' Braddock refused the purse, insisted on the duel, was disarmed, and would not even ask his life. However, with all his brutality, he has lately been Governor of Gibraltar, where he made himself adored, and where scarce any governor was endured before."

We find but few instances where Horace Walpole interested himself in public matters. Although for a great number of years a member of the House of Commons, he seems to have been busied more in studying the manœuvres of parties, than in investigating the measures which came up for consideration. In fact, his course illustrates how preposterous the borough system had already become, and how little responsibility seemed to be attached to the representatives under it. When Walpole did act, it was from sudden impulse, proceeding rather from the generosity of his heart than from the conviction of public duties. The only occasion on which we have any account of his addressing the house, except in relation to one or two unimportant matters, was on a motion made to inquire into the conduct of his father, for ten years preceding his resignation. This speech was a filial tribute to his father's reputation. The affair of Admiral Byng was calculated to awaken all his sensibilities, and for once to arouse his energies. He believed this unfortunate man to be the victim not only of an unmerited persecution, but of the folly and misconduct of the ministry, towards whom he bore no peculiar good-will. With the admiral he declares he was totally unacquainted; and he had never seen him but once, when he thought his carriage haughty and disgusting. He succeeded in getting a bill passed in the house to absolve the members of the court-martial from their oath of secrecy, but it was rejected by the lords. Byng was executed; and Walpole never forgave his persecutors.

These volumes do not admit of condensation. The author, even in a single letter, takes so many flights, that it is almost impossible to follow him in a connected manner. The death of a friend may be announced in a paragraph preceding a *bon-mot*, or a court intrigue. The affairs of the nation are broken in upon by an amour in high life, or by a murder or robbery, for which indeed Walpole manifests a most morbid appetite. For this reason, and as letters, they are perhaps as readable as any in the language; but, it must be confessed, they abound in much that a future collector of his writings might advantageously expunge. We lay them aside, however, with a wish to see more of his correspondence. If that which remains unpub-

lished has pretensions any way akin to the merits of this, we hope that those who have it in their possession will speedily give it to the world.

ART. VIII.—*The Infirmities of Genius, illustrated by referring the anomalies in the literary character to the habits and constitutional peculiarities of men of genius.*
By R. R. MADDEN, Esq., Author of "Travels in Turkey," &c. London.

THE popularity of Mr. Madden's "Travels in Turkey," notwithstanding the severe animadversions to which the work was subjected in some quarters, has doubtless induced him to make this fresh essay in authorship. The topic he has chosen has, however, but little of consanguinity with the former; and if we are to be guided by the sentiments of those who "saw reason to suspect 'from his Travels in Turkey,' that he was superficial, inaccurate and presumptuous—that on his assertions a very qualified reliance should be placed, and on his inferences none," we should infer, from his present production, not only that he labours under all these disqualifications, but further, "that he is singularly ignorant of the class of men and facts which he has undertaken to discuss;—that in general learning he seems to be below what is called a smatterer, and the turn of his mind is evidently neither accurate in observation, precise in distinction, sagacious in analysis, nor comprehensive in synthetical combination;—that he is little versed in medical, and still less in moral philosophy; and though his pages are illustrated with great names and copious quotations, he gives us the impression of knowing of the men and the books he mentions little more than the name."

Such is the hard measure allotted to Mr. Madden in a recent notice of the work before us, in a popular British periodical, not celebrated for its impartiality, justice, or freedom from prejudice; and in this case we think unnecessarily severe, and disporting with the author's feeling, as it were, from mere wantonness.

It is true that many of the learned quotations with which the work is interlarded, are incorrectly given: that there is too often a flippancy of style, and a flimsiness of argument: but no one can peruse the work, with an unbiassed mind, without being satisfied that the author is not the ignoramus he is described; but, on the other hand, that his powers of description

are of no common order, and that he occasionally exhibits signal sagacity in his deductions, even when they are, in our judgment, most erroneous.

The subject of the infirmities of genius is one of the most striking that could be selected; and when judiciously managed, is capable of affording entertainment and instruction to all. It is a constant remark, that genius is necessarily allied to infirmities, and accordingly the aberrations of such as are characterized by their intellectual powers are viewed with an eye of compassion, and every apology made for faults, which, in the less gifted, would be looked upon as unpardonable. This has been partly owing, perhaps, to the fact that many of the higher literati have laboured under bodily diseases, which have been regarded as induced by their studious and necessarily sedentary habits; and these diseases, by reacting on the *moral*, have been presumed to occasion the eccentricities for which many of them have been distinguished. The waywardness resulting in this way from disease, has elicited the sympathies even of such as are not in the habit of making much allowance for ordinary infirmities.

"The more extensive our knowledge of human nature is, (says Mr. Madden,) and the better acquainted we make ourselves with that strong influence which mind and body mutually exert, the greater will be the indulgence towards the errors of our species, and the more will our affections be enlarged. How slight are those alterations in health—almost imperceptible to the ordinary observer—which have produced or aggravated the gravest mental infirmities; and how incapable is he of forming a just idea of them, who is unable not only to detect, but to estimate the importance of those apparently trivial physical derangements with which they are so intimately connected.

"It would be a folly to imagine that an ordinary disease exerts such an absolute dominion over the mind, that the moral perceptions are overpowered or perverted, and that the individual ceases to be responsible for his errors. When the intemperate man 'puts an enemy into his mouth to steal away his senses,' and under its maddening influence commits a violent assault upon his neighbour, no one doubts but that a state of temporary insanity was productive of the offence; nevertheless, the offender knew that such insanity was the inevitable consequence of intemperance, and he is punished for it accordingly.

"The literary man who indulges in habits prejudicial to his health, cannot be supposed ignorant of the effects that must arise from excessive application; and who can say he is guiltless of the infirmities he drags upon him?

"There is a case, in our criminal records, of a thief going out in the middle of the night to rob a hen-roost, and, being attacked by a dog, fired at the animal, and chanced to kill a servant of its owner, who had concealed himself behind the kennel. There was no malice; the mischief was unpremeditated, but the last degree of violence was incidental to the first, and the law did not hold him guiltless of the murder.

"The studious man sets out with stealing an hour or two from his ordinary repose—sometimes perhaps more—and finishes by devoting whole nights to his pursuits. But this night-work leads to exhaustion, and the

universal sense of sinking in every organ that accompanies it, suggests the use of stimulants, most probably of wine; alcohol, however, in some shape or other. And what is the result? Why, the existence that is passed in a constant circle of excitement and exhaustion is shortened, or rendered miserable by such alternations, and the victim becomes accessory to his own sufferings.

"These are, indeed, extreme cases, yet are they cases in point; in all are the offenders held responsible for their crimes or errors, but nevertheless they are entitled to our pity.

"In a word, if the literary man consume his strength and spirits in his study, forego all necessary exercise, keep his mind continually on the stretch, and even, at his meals, deprive the digestive organs of that nervous energy which is then essential to their healthy action; if the proteiform symptoms of dyspepsia at last make their appearance, and the innumerable anomalous sufferings which, under the name of nervous and stomachic ailments, derange the viscera, and rack the joints of the invalid; if, by constant application, the blood is continually determined to the brain, and the calibre of the vessels enlarged, to the extent of causing pressure or effusion in that vital organ; in any case, if the mischief then is allowed to proceed slowly and steadily, perhaps for years, (as in the case of Swift,) giving rise to a long train of nervous miseries; to hypochondria in its gloomiest form, or mania in its wildest mood, or paralysis in the expressionless aspect of fatuity, (that frequent termination of the literary career,) who can deny that the sufferer has, in a great measure, drawn the evil on himself—but who will not admit that his infirmities of mind and body are entitled to indulgence and compassion?"

The belief that literary occupations are positively injurious to health, is almost universal, and that it may occasionally happen cannot be denied. We are convinced, however, that they are less frequently the cause of disease than is imagined. Few are injured by study—unless unusually protracted—but it is more agreeable for the relatives to have this cause assigned, although in too many cases the studies have had but little agency in the result. More than once, indeed, we have known diseases, brought on by juvenile indiscretion, referred to excessive application at the desk, or in the study. There is something consolatory in the idea, that even self-immolation has been voluntarily incurred by habits so creditable in all ages, but especially in youth; and the suffused eye of the mourning relative gleams with a melancholy pleasure when she reflects on the honourable path which the unfortunate victim pursued.

Who is there that would not be almost tempted to incur this honourable martyrdom, if he could be satisfied that he might have a Byron to celebrate his apotheosis in such touching lines as those in which he alludes to Henry Kirke White, and especially in the beautiful metaphor applicable to every similar case with which he concludes them, and which we think is unsurpassed by any thing in our own, or any other language.

"So the struck eagle, stretch'd upon the plain,
No more through rolling clouds to soar again,

View'd his own feather on the fatal dart,
And wing'd the shaft that quiver'd in his heart:
Keen were his pangs, but keener far to feel
He nurs'd the pinion which impell'd the steel,
While the same plumage that had warm'd his nest,
Drank the last life-drop of his bleeding breast."

The diseases that have usually been ascribed to hard study, are such as implicate the great organ of the intellect more especially,—as mania, epilepsy and palsy. Such affections would appear to have been occasionally produced by the cause assigned, but they must be extremely rare. The diseases with which the literary are especially afflicted, are those to which the sedentary are liable, even when the intellect may remain inactive; and accordingly, dyspepsia, and its gloomy concomitant hypochondriasis, with general torpor of the digestive apparatus, owing to corporeal inaction, are the common results; but these diseases are of a chronic nature, and by no means liable to destroy, although most distressing to the sufferer; and accordingly, it may be unhesitatingly affirmed, that literary men, as a body, attain as high a degree of longevity as those of any other avocation. This has been the case in all ages. In antiquity it was most remarkable; and all our associations of ancient wisdom are attached to the hair whitened by time, and those venerable busts, exhibiting the characteristics of the accumulated wisdom of ages. Germany affords us an instance of a class of men who devote themselves from an early age to literary pursuits exclusively, and their longevity has been every where a subject of comment.

We have said, that literary pursuits are less frequently the cause of disease than is imagined; but it has been mentioned, and with much evidence in its favour, that the pursuit of letters in Germany, as every where else in the world, is evidently favourable to longevity.* The distinguished physician and naturalist, Blumenbach, asserts, that for the half century and more of his connexion with one of the most celebrated universities in Europe, he has not known a solitary example of any youth falling victim to his ardour in the pursuit of intellectual distinction; and Eichhorn, perhaps the most voluminous writer of the day, the eminent philologist and historian, is said to boldly affirm, "that no one ever died of hard study." The idea is preposterous. A man may fret himself to death over his books, or any where else; but literary application would tend to diffuse cheerfulness, and rather prolong than shorten the life of an infirm man. Our experience accords completely with that of Eichhorn, although immeasurably short of his—and with the writer of the article to which we have referred.

* American Quarterly, No. XI. p. 203.

The opportunities of the latter for observation occurred in the eastern part of this country; ours in the southern and in Europe, where we do not recollect a solitary case of serious mischief having been induced by intellectual application, although, as we have remarked, the cause has not unfrequently been assigned.

The author before us is disposed to infer, from tables drawn up by himself, and which, as we shall see, are far from unobjectionable, that there is more wear and tear from literary pursuits, in which the imagination is vigorously exerted, than where any other faculty of the mind is as energetically called into action; and farther, he thinks, the earlier the mental powers are developed, the sooner do the bodily powers begin to fail.

“For the purpose (he remarks) of ascertaining the influence of different studies on the longevity of authors, the tables which follow have been constructed; in which the names and ages of the most celebrated authors in the various departments of literature and science are set down; each list containing twenty names of those individuals who have devoted their lives to a particular pursuit, and excelled in it. No other attention has been given to the selection than that which eminence suggested, without any regard to the ages of those who presented themselves to notice. The object was to give a fair view of the subject, whether it told for or against the opinions that have been expressed in the preceding pages. It must, however, be taken into account, that, as we have only given the names of the most celebrated authors, and, in the last table, those of artists in their different departments, a greater longevity in each pursuit might be inferred from the aggregate of the ages than properly may belong to the general range of life in each pursuit. For example, in moral or natural philosophy, a long life of labour is necessary to enable posterity to judge of the merits of an author, and these are ascertained not only by the value, but also by the amount of his compositions. It is by a series of researches and recasts of opinion, that profound truths are arrived at, and by numerous publications that such truths are forced on the public attention. For this a long life is necessary, and it certainly appears, from the list that is subjoined, that the vigour of a great intellect is favourable to longevity in every literary pursuit, wherein imagination is seldom called on.”

From tables, formed on the plan detailed in the foregoing extract, Mr. Madden deduces the following order of longevity, and the average duration of life of the most eminent in each pursuit:

	<i>Average Years.</i>	<i>Average Years.</i>
Natural philosophers,	1494	75
Moral philosophers,	1417	70
Sculptors and painters,	1412	70
Authors on Law and Jurisprudence,	1394	69
Medical authors,	1368	68
Authors on Revealed Religion,	1350	67
Philologists,	1323	66
Musical composers,	1284	64
Novelists and miscellaneous authors,	1257	62½
Dramatists,	1244	62
Authors on Natural Religion,	1245	62
Poets,	1144	57

In the separate tables, however, which give occasion to these results, we have the different pursuits coupled with each other in a way which is to us unintelligible. Table I. for example, contrasts the "Natural Philosophers" with the "Poets," for no other reason, we presume, than that they are the highest and lowest in Mr. Madden's scale. In Table II. the "Moral Philosophers" are classed with the "Dramatists;" and in the remaining Tables the "Authors on Law and Jurisprudence" are opposed to the "Miscellaneous and Novel Writers;" the "Authors on Revealed Religion" to the "Authors on Natural Religion;" the "Medical Authors" to the "Philologists;" and the "Artists" to the "Musical Composers."

All this is of course arbitrary; for although there may be some reason for placing the highest and the lowest in the scale in contrast, we do not see why the Medical Authors and the Philologists should have been contrasted together, or the authors on Law and Jurisprudence with the Miscellaneous and Novel writers, rather than with any other.

It is manifest, too, that, in the formation of all such tables, much room is allowed for the intrusion of error. Different individuals may have different views regarding those who are the most eminent, and the greatest discrepancy may be exhibited in the results, although the investigators may be equally disposed to discard intentional error.

In illustration of this we will take one of the lists as selected by Mr. Madden, of individuals with whose acquirements he may, from his profession, be presumed to be most familiar, and place along side it one chosen by ourselves, with the view of exhibiting the difference that may readily and honestly arise in such estimates. It is probable, however, that the maxim Mr. Madden was desirous of inculcating, "that the vigour of a great intellect is favourable to longevity, in every literary pursuit, wherein imagination is seldom called on," may have unconsciously biassed him in his selection; otherwise, how can one account for his omission of the name of Bichat, distinguished above all his contemporaries for the light which his observant and penetrating mind diffused over the different departments of medical science, of some of which, indeed, he may be regarded as the founder; Bichat, of whom Corvisart so feelingly and justly remarked in his letter to the first consul, announcing his death:

"Bichat vient de mourir sur un champ de bataille qui compte aussi plus d'une victime; personne en si peu de temps, n'a fait tant de choses et aussi bien."

Of Bichat, we are not old enough to have known any thing personally. His works are all-sufficient to account for the estimation in which he is held by the members of his profession, and

if it had pleased the Almighty to permit his light to have still farther penetrated the obscurities in which many departments of natural science are yet enveloped, there is no saying how far its effulgence might have reached.

With his gifted biographer, M. Miguel, we had the pleasure of an intimate acquaintance. Little did he imagine, when he penned the following eloquent tribute to the merits of Bichat, which gained for him the prize offered by the *Société d'Emulation et d'Agriculture, Belles Lettres et Arts*, of the department of the Ain,* that he should so soon need the "generous tear he paid," and be doomed to have his talents laid in the dust, at the moment when they were beginning to enlighten his fellow men. "A man," remarks M. Miguel, "is born with a disposition the most favourable for the study of a science consecrated to the relief of humanity; his childhood is carefully cultivated by a tender as well as enlightened parent. His first steps are directed by a skilful master (Desault.) Soon separated from him by the grave, he enters alone and unsupported upon the career which is open to him; darts with a rapid flight towards the goal it presents; elevates himself above his rivals, who contemplate him with astonishment, in regions inaccessible to the cries of envy and the intrigues of mediocrity; hovers for some time over the scattered wrecks of systems, which are mouldering away, as if to find a place where his hand might rebuild the edifice of science; and from these sublime heights he falls, dying, in the midst of the garlands reserved for him, regarding with his last look the road he was desirous of pursuing, and with his finger pointing to his pupils the route they ought to follow. Such was the history of Bichat. His life was but a rapid journey; his existence was only as the lightning; but his name will not remain less eternally graven in the annals of science. Posterity, which has already commenced for him, has irrevocably adjudged his merit. Time has done justice, both as respects some slight errors of his youth, and the harsh critiques and iniquitous judgments levelled against him. The admiration of France has avenged his memory for the disdain of envy, and the light which his works have carried into the science of man, far from being extinguished with him, shines every day with fresh splendour.

"It is by the aid of his light that we dare penetrate into the mystery of life, and that we walk with confidence into the vast field of observation. Disengaged from the fetters which embarrassed his uncertain progress, the physiologist employs himself in becoming acquainted with the laws of vitality, and disdains the visionary theories that had too long led his predecessors

* *Eloge de Xavier Bichat, &c.*, par ANTOINE MIGUEL, Docteur en Médecine, Membre de Plusieurs Sociétés Savantes. Paris, 1825.

astray. Illuminated in his turn by the torch of physiology, the physician studies the connexion between the wheels of the living machine, observes the causes that disturb their equilibrium or trouble their harmony, penetrates into the most occult secrets of organism, and if success should not follow his efforts, and weakness of sight not permit him to fathom all the depths of nature, he knows how to prefer doubt to error, and to stop before he becomes lost in the ways of abstraction.

"To Bichat belongs the glory of having traced the line which can alone conduct us to truth. It is he who, profiting by the works of celebrated individuals, has put an end to the uncertainty and hesitation that retarded our progress. As if he had a presentiment of the premature death that awaited him, he did not lose his earlier years in combating the errors which obscured his views, and in overturning the idols who had escaped our homage. He displayed truth, and innumerable disciples rushed after his footsteps. The enthusiasm which he communicated to them still continues, and under the most opposing barriers a unanimous cry arises to proclaim the name of Bichat."

Yet this illustrious man is not included in the list of Mr. Madden; whilst Corvisart, far his inferior, is there, with Tissot, Jenner and Fordyce, who, whatever advantages they may have rendered to medical science, were certainly not pre-eminent as medical authors. Darwin, too, might with far more propriety have been classed with the poets, for there certainly is more of poetry than of history in his few medical publications; and Paracelsus is elevated to a rank, of which so notorious a charlatan is unworthy.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Age.</i>	<i>Name.</i>	<i>Age.</i>
1. Brown, John	54	1. Beclard,	40
2. Corvisart,	66	2. Bichat,	31
3. Cullen,	78	3. Boerhaave, H.	70
4. Darwin,	72	4. Chaussier,	82
5. Fordyce,	67	5. Cullen,	78
6. Fothergill,	69	6. Fothergill,	68
7. Gall,	71	7. Frank, J. P.	76
8. Gregory, John	48	8. Gall,	70
9. Harvey, W.	81	9. Georget,	33
10. Heberden,	92	10. Godman,	32
11. Hoffman,	83	11. Good, J. M.	62
12. Hunter, J.	65	12. Gregory, James	68
13. Hunter, W.	66	13. Haller,	69
14. Jenner,	75	14. Hunter, J.	65
15. Good, J. M.	64	15. Laennec,	45
16. Paracelsus,	43	16. Mead,	81
17. Pinel,	84	17. Pinel,	81
18. Sydenham,	66	18. Reil, J. C.	54
19. Tissot,	70	19. Sommering, S. T.	75
20. Willis, T.	54	20. Sydenham,	65
Total 1368		Total 1245	

In our list the names of Beclard, Bichat, Georget and Godman have been added amongst others, none of whose ages exceeded forty, and but one attained it. The first of these distinguished men was professor of anatomy in the most celebrated medical school of the time—the *Ecole de Medecine* of Paris. He was born in 1785, and died in 1825. His talents were of the highest order, and his mode of communicating instruction profound but lucid. His publications were not numerous, but they were most creditable to him. The “*Elements of General Anatomy*” have been translated both in this country and in England, and they signally exhibit the acquaintance of the author with the complicated organism of man. His Additions, too, to the “*General Anatomy*” of Bichat, have tended to illustrate and to develop the views of his distinguished master. Of that master we have already spoken, and although we are almost irresistibly impelled to dwell on the name and the deeds of one whose fame must endure as long as the memory of the worthies of by-gone days can be preserved, we must restrain our feelings.

Amongst his numerous claims to the gratitude of his contemporaries and posterity, were his “*Treatise on the Membranes*,” his “*Physiological Researches on Life and Death*,” and his “*General Anatomy applied to Physiology and to Medicine*,”—his greatest and most important undertaking. This was translated into English by Dr. Hayward of Boston; and within the last few years there appeared his “*Pathological Anatomy*,” in one volume, 8vo., which was translated into English by Dr. Togno of Philadelphia.

Of M. Georget’s claims to respectful notice—had we not possessed the advantage of personal knowledge—his “*Essay on Insanity*,” his “*Physiology of the Nervous System*,” and especially of the “*Brain*,” and his “*Treatise on the Neuroses or Nervous Diseases*,” would have been amply sufficient to convince us. He was one of the original projectors of the new “*Dictionnaire de Medecine*,” and enriched that valuable work by many monographs. One of these was the basis of his “*Essay on Insanity*.” A pupil of the celebrated Esquirol, and a constant attendant at La Salpêtrière in Paris—the great hospital for those of unsound mind—his attention had been particularly directed to the “*Physiology and Diseases of the Brain*,” and the results of his observation and reflection, as contained in his various publications, have stamped him as a deep and original thinker, and as an accurate discriminator of those singular cases of mental aberration, which so frequently present themselves, and are appreciated with so much difficulty. He died in 1828, at the early age of thirty-three.

The propriety of introducing into the list our own Godman,

who, in spite of the disadvantages of fortune, and a brief existence spent in sickness and in suffering, succeeded in elevating himself to a high rank amongst physicians and naturalists, no one will dispute. He has so recently passed away from us, that many of the readers of these pages have scarcely recovered from the sorrow which his death, although long expected, had engendered. The eulogies passed upon him in the journals of the time, and still repeated as examples to the young, to excite them to energetic exertion in their calling, and to exhibit to them what untiring zeal, united with ability, is capable of accomplishing, sufficiently depict the honourable distinction which he had attained, and the regret which his early death inspired. Twice, within the last four months, it has been our pleasing lot to hear the merits of this extraordinary genius celebrated, and on one of the occasions by an individual not less distinguished than the subject of his biography, and whose zeal and enthusiasm in the cultivation of his profession, guided by unusual abilities, natural and acquired, have placed him near the pinnacle of science. We mention these circumstances to show how signally worthy the name of Godman is of being placed in any list of professional worthies, and we cannot avoid citing the following just tribute to his memory from the pen of a literary gentleman unconnected with the medical faculty.

"The tributes," he observes, "which have been paid in the newspapers to the late Dr. Godman, were especially due to the memory of a man so variously gifted by nature, and so nobly distinguished by industry and zeal in the acquisition and advancement of science. He did not enjoy early opportunities of self-improvement, but he cultivated his talents, as he approached manhood, with a degree of ardour and success, which supplied all deficiencies, and he finally became one of the most accomplished general scholars and linguists, acute and erudite naturalists, ready, pleasing, and instructive lecturers and writers, of his country and era. The principal subject of his study was anatomy in its main branches, in which he excelled in every respect. His attention was much directed, also, to Physiology, Pathology, and Natural History, with an aptitude and efficiency abundantly proved by the merits of his published works, which we need not enumerate.

"We do not now recollect to have known any individual who inspired us with more respect for his intellect and heart, than Dr. Godman; to whom knowledge and discovery appeared more abstractly precious; whose eye shed more of the lustre of generous and enlightened enthusiasm; whose heart remained more vivid and sympathetic, amid professional labour and res-

possibility, always extremely severe and urgent. Considering the decline of his health, for a long period, and the pressure of adverse circumstances, which he too frequently experienced, he performed prodigies as a student, an author, and a teacher; he prosecuted extensive and diversified researches; composed superior disquisitions and reviews, and large and valuable volumes; and in the great number of topics which he handled simultaneously or in immediate succession, he touched none without doing himself credit, and producing some new development of light, or happy forms of expression.

"He lingered for years under consumption of the lungs; understood fully the incurableness of his melancholy state; spoke and acted with an unfeigned and beautiful resignation; toiled at his desk to the last day of his thirty-two years, still glowing with the love of science and the domestic affections. The reputation, the writings, and the family of this victim of the most exalted ambition and refined propensities, should be greatly and widely cherished."

Of his serious meditations, when he fully felt that all hope of recovery was past, and that his dissolution was approaching, the following is an example—

"'Tis midnight's solemn hour! now wide unfurl'd,
Darkness expands her mantle o'er the world;
The fire-fly's lamp has ceas'd its fitful gleam;
The cricket's chirp is hush'd; the boding scream
Of the gray owl is still'd; the lofty trees
Scarce wave their summits to the failing breeze;
All nature is at rest, or seems to sleep;
'Tis thine alone, oh man! to watch and weep!
Thine 'tis to feel thy system's sad decay,
As flares the taper of thy life away,
Beneath the influence of fell disease:—
Thine 'tis to *know* the want of mental ease,
Springing from memory of time misspent;
Of slighted blessings, deepest discontent,
And riotous rebellion 'gainst the laws
Of health, truth, heav'n, to win the world's applause."

"I cannot place before you, young gentlemen," says the author of an Eulogy on Dr. Godman, delivered appropriately as an introduction to a course of lectures on Anatomy and Physiology,*—"in this commencement of your professional career, an example more worthy than the one we have been contemplating; but I admonish you, while you aspire to the honours he

* *An Eulogy on Dr. Godman, being an introductory lecture delivered November 1, 1830, by THOMAS SEWALL, M.D., Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in the Columbian College, District of Columbia. Washington, 1830.*

achieved, not to forget to mark the steps by which he reached the lofty eminence on which he stood. Keep constantly before you that thirst for knowledge, that ardent zeal, that stability and energy of purpose, that untiring industry, that ceaseless spirit of exertion which animated his bosom, and to the last urged him onward—and while you regret that a mind so active, ardent and elevated, is no longer to impart its conceptions to others—that the spirit-stirring voice which cheered the student, and guided his steps in the paths of science—which delighted the social, and shed joy and gladness around the domestic circle, is silent in the grave, cease not to emulate that noble love of truth, that simplicity of character, that honesty of intention, that piety and benevolence of heart, which lighted up his pathway, and stripped the avenues to the grave of its terrors. Do this, and you may look beyond the gloom of the sepulchre to the bright abode of his departed spirit, and there with him hope to rest.”

Such are the characters of those, in the list we have selected, who died young in years, but old in honour. From such a list they could not with propriety have been excluded; nor could we well have omitted Laennec, who, although his pen was by no means prolific, has the merit of having proposed a most valuable mode of investigating diseases of the chest, now adopted in every quarter of the globe, and of elucidating several morbid states of the lungs and heart, where all was previously obscure. His work on “Auscultation,” or listening to the audible evidences of thoracic derangement, with and without the aid of the instrument of his invention, the stethoscope, has been translated into most of the European languages, and is read and appreciated everywhere.

Now, if we refer to the list cited from Mr. Madden, we find the average duration of the lives of medical authors to be sixty-eight; so that their longevity is, in his table, next below that of the authors on law and jurisprudence, and immediately above that of the authors on revealed religion.

The corresponding table, however, formed by ourselves, gives the average at only sixty-two, placing the medical authors with the dramatists, and authors on natural religion, or almost the lowest in the scale: and if we had inserted, in the place of names perhaps not more distinguished, those of Miguel of Paris, Gordon of Edinburgh, and our own Dorsey, none of whose ages exceeded thirty-five, the average would have been as low as in some of those tables, where imagination is presumed to have produced such disastrous effects upon the health. It is singular that we should not find in the list of Mr. Madden the rate of any individual under forty-three years of age, and but one so young as that—the notorious Paracelsus. The next youngest

is Dr. John Gregory, who died at the age of forty-eight. Mr. Madden must consequently have had some reason for rejecting those whose deaths were so untimely. We would not be uncharitable, but it appears too manifest that the theory he was desirous of establishing might have had some effect in distorting his choice. If we inquire into the nature and number of the contributions made to science by many of those on his list, we find that but few of them had distinguished themselves at the same age to any thing like the extent of Beclard, Bichat, Georget or Godman; and if we suppose for a moment what might have been produced by these eminent men, if they had been permitted to live as long as Corvisart, Hoffman or Tissot, we cannot but believe that their titles to distinction would have been yet more signal.

They, who are early cut off in their career, and have left imperishable memorials of their having been, are indeed the most fitting subjects for such lists: yet they have been excluded by our author.

It is obvious, that all such tables are liable to the objection, that no correct approximation can be afforded by them. So much is left to the whim and caprice of the compiler, and so much depends upon his preconceived notions, that no two estimates will be found to agree, and consequently no such general rule as that deduced by Mr. Madden, can be legitimately embraced; yet he regards his deductions as canonical.

"The amount of the united ages of the medical authors, (he remarks,) exceeds that of the novelists and essayists by one hundred and twelve years; and here again, the authors 'of imagination all compact,' are found very nearly at the bottom of the list, while those into whose pursuits imagination little enters, in point of longevity, rank high above them. It may be truly said, without any hyperbole, that every pursuit which ennobles the mind, has a tendency to invigorate the body, and by its tranquilizing influence, to add to the duration of life.

"That study which carries the contemplation of its follower to the highest regions of philosophy, we have already seen, is the pursuit of all others, the most conducive to longevity. But the mechanism of the heavens is only more wonderful than that of the human form, because the magnitude of the scale on which the movements of that mechanism are carried on, requires the greatest effort which the mind is capable of making, even imperfectly to conceive. But what is there more wonderful in the laws which regulate the motions of innumerable worlds, than that principle of life which animates the dust of which one human being is compounded. What is there more stupendous in the idea of the power that gives precision, velocity, and effulgence to the swiftest and brightest of those orbs, than in the conception of that power, which bestows the spirit of vitality and the attribute of reason on man? Infinite wisdom is only differently displayed, it matters not how, whether in the revolutions of the planets, or the circulation of the blood, in the transmission of solar light and heat, or in the mechanism of the eye, or the sensibility of the nerves; the inquiring mind is ultimately carried to the same creative power. But above all philosophers, to the medical observer, what a miracle of wisdom is the

formation of the human body, and the wonderful faculties superadded to its organization! 'What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving, how express and admirable! in action, how like an angel! in apprehension, how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!' In a word, the tendency of the pursuits of the physician is to enlarge his understanding, and to enlighten his views on every subject to which they are directed."

The average deduced from our table of medical authors, is a sufficient reply to some of Mr. Madden's musings at the commencement of the above extract. Every thing, however, in his tables, goes to satisfy him that imagination, over-exerted, is a fell destroyer of mankind; yet this does not tally well with his subsequent remark, "that every pursuit which ennobles the mind has a tendency to invigorate the body, and by its tranquillizing influence to add to the duration of life." Mr. Madden can scarcely mean to affirm, that the efforts of the imagination do not belong to pursuits of this kind. What more ennobles the mind than lofty imaginings, than sublime conceptions?

Surely the efforts of genius are entitled to as high a rank as any other.

But is it true that poets are shorter-lived than other authors; or, in other words, that the play of the imagination in poetical composition has the effect of curtailing the duration of existence? So far as such individuals are frequently persons of acute sensibility, of lively imagination, the remark may be just, within proper limits.

The signal influence exerted by the *moral* on the *physique*, and conversely, is a topic of interesting investigation with the physiologist; and nothing is better established than that there is a wide difference amongst mankind in these respects, and that the nervous, the delicate, the easily impressible—they whose nervous systems are so tenderly organized as to feel the slightest shocks—are more liable to morbid derangements, mental as well as corporeal, than such as are, to use the language of Meiners, more inflexible. This, however, does not apply to the poet solely; but to many who are not alive to the beauties of poetry in any of its subdivisions; to many of the fairer part of creation, who are proverbially nervous, and hysterical-acutely sensible to impressions; and to all those perhaps who are regarded, and with propriety, to possess *genius*: yet this genius may not exhibit itself in poetry simply, but may brilliantly illumine those departments of science or art in which the more staid faculties of the mind are exerted, and which are regarded by our author as markedly dangerous. The possessor of the attributes that are looked upon as the characteristics of genius, is apt to be led into irregularities less likely to befall those who are not as highly gifted; and these irregularities, acting upon a frame unusually

susceptible, and easily thrown off the track by deranging influences, have probably a large share in the causation of diseases to which such individuals are liable.

In the table of Mr. Madden, in which he contrasts the Natural Philosophers with the Poets, there is certainly a great disparity in the average amount of years attained by the twenty persons on each list; the former amounting to 1494 years, the latter to 1144, or being in the ratios to each other of 1000 to 783.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHERS.		POETS.	
<i>Name.</i>	<i>Age.</i>	<i>Name.</i>	<i>Age.</i>
1. Bacon,	78	Ariosto,	59
2. Buffon,	81	Burns,	38
3. Copernicus,	70	Byron,	37
4. Cuvier,	64	Camoens,	55
5. Davy,	51	Collins,	56
6. Euler,	76	Cowley,	49
7. Franklin,	85	Cowper,	69
8. Galileo,	78	Dante,	56
9. Halley, Dr.	86	Dryden,	70
10. Herschel,	84	Goldsmith,	44
11. Kepler,	60	Gray,	57
12. La Lande,	75	Metastasio,	84
13. La Place,	77	Milton,	66
14. Leeuenhoek,	91	Petrarch,	68
15. Leibnitz,	70	Pope,	56
16. Linnæus,	72	Shenstone,	50
17. Newton,	84	Spencer,	46
18. Tycho Brahe,	55	Tasso,	52
19. Whiston,	95	Thomson,	48
20. Woollaston,	62	Young,	84
Total 1494		Total 1144	

We do not intend to prefer any strong objections against the list of poets selected by Mr. Madden; although, if we were disposed, we could present a few names, as substitutes for some he has chosen, against which no cogent objections could be made, and which would raise the total amount of years much above what it is in the table. We might, for example, cite Chaucer, whose title to distinction none can dispute, who died at the age of seventy-two. Gothe—"the poet of philosophy"—"the universal poet," as he has been termed, who died at the age of eighty-three. Klopstock, the German Milton, who lived to the age of seventy-nine; and Wieland, distinguished for his rich and boundless imagination, who attained the same age. Similar examples could indeed be adduced from the history of any of the modern nations of Europe—we say *modern*, because if we go back to ancient times, we are struck with the advanced age which their poets, as well as the literary men of all classes, attained. Moreover, if we inquire into the habits of life of many

of the poets selected by Mr. Madden, we may discover abundant cause for their early decease.

Burns, for example, was notoriously addicted to the use of spirituous liquors, until he completely ruined his constitution, and brought on the disease which destroyed him. His is consequently by no means a fair case for elucidating the effect of poetical pursuits on the health. It would better suit the pages of the Temperance Recorder. His productions, too, were not the offspring of application. "The patent of his honours," as Byron would have said, "was held direct from the Almighty;" and his poetry was produced fitfully, and whenever his imagination suggested; but he was not the poet of application. Yet Mr. Madden has chosen him for lengthened disquisition, and for the elucidation of a position, which his case is well calculated to overthrow. The following extract from the work before us offers a satisfactory explanation for the premature deaths of others in the list.

"In Burns's time intemperance was much more common in his walk of life than it now is. In Pope's day we find not a few of his most celebrated contemporaries and immediate predecessors addicted to drunkenness. 'Cowley's death (Pope says) was occasioned by a mere accident, while his great friend Dean Pratt was on a visit with him at Chertsey. They had been together to see a neighbour of Cowley's, who (according to the fashion of the times) made them too welcome. They did not set out on their walk home till it was too late, and had drunk so deep, that they lay out in the fields all night. This gave Cowley the fever that carried him off.

"Dryden, like Burns, was remarkable for sobriety in early life, 'but for the last ten years of his life (says Dennis,) he was much acquainted with Addison, and drank with him even more than he was used to do, probably so far as to hasten his end.' Yet in his case, as Byron's, wine seems to have had no exhilarating influence; speaking of his melancholy, he says, 'nor wine nor love could make me gay.' And Byron speaks of wine making him 'savage instead of mirthful.'

"Parnell, also (on Pope's authority), 'was a great follower of drams, and strangely open and scandalous in his debaucheries, (his excesses, however, only commenced after the death of his wife, whom he tenderly loved,) and those helps, (he adds,) that sorrow first called in for assistance, habit soon rendered necessary, and he died in his thirty-sixth year, in some measure a martyr to conjugal fidelity, somewhat we presume in the way

'Of Lord Mount Coffeehouse, the British peer,
Who died of love with wine last year.'

"But another account describes Parnell's taking to drunkenness on account of his prospect declining as a preacher at the queen's death, 'and so he became a sot, and finished his existence.'

"Churchill was found drunk on a dunghill.

"Prior, according to Spencer, 'used to bury himself for whole days and nights together with a poor mean creature, his celebrated Chloe,' who, unlike Rensard's Cassandra, was the barmaid of the house he frequented. And even Pope, we are told by Dr. King, hastened his end by drinking spirits."

So that, according to Mr. Madden's own admission, and it

will be observed he adduces evidence against himself with admirable *naïveté*, four of the poets on his list were addicted to habits more tangible and destructive than the simple pursuits of the imagination, and three of those, Burns, Dryden, and Pope, are considered to have hastened their end, if not to have actually destroyed themselves, by drinking.

But let us dispassionately examine into the circumstances connected with the lives of some of the others on Mr. Madden's list, so far as relates to our subject. Of the history of the "divine Ariosto" we know but little; we mean of the private history. His age, at the time of his death, was respectable.* The age of Camoens, the most celebrated of the Portuguese poets, is given by Mr. Madden at fifty-five. He died in his sixty-second year, notwithstanding that he had spent great part of his life in the unhealthy regions of India, and on his return to Portugal was in such penury, that a slave, whom he carried with him from India, begged in the streets to support the life of his master.

Collins, the poet of the Passions, in every sense of the word—as possessor, as depicter—was of the most irregular habits; so little controul, indeed, did he exert over his unfortunate propensities, that it was thought best to confine him in a lunatic asylum. He died at the early age of thirty-six—not fifty-six, as Mr. Madden has it.

Cowper, in spite of his insanity, lived to the goodly age of sixty-nine, almost the "three-score years and ten," and died ultimately of dropsy.

The life of Goldsmith, eventful as it was in misery, was terminated by a low fever, which appears to have been in no respect induced by the play of the imagination. Beautiful, indeed, as are the outpourings of his muse, they are few in number, and could not have occupied so much of his time as those of his productions in which the imagination is less invoked,—the "Citizen of the World," the "Bee," the "History of England," the "History of Greece," and the "History of the Earth and Animated Nature." It is, indeed, difficult to know how to class an individual, who, as Dr. Johnson observed, left no species of writing untouched, and adorned all to which he applied himself. He was certainly as worthy of being ranged amongst the dramatists as some that Mr. Madden has placed there. His comedy of "She Stoops to Conquer," is superior to any of the productions of some of those individuals.

Gray died of the gout in the stomach, in his fifty-fifth year,

* Byron died of fever, brought on by exposure in a most unhealthy locality, united with epilepsy, to which he had been subject, and which is one of the diseases presumed by Mr. Madden to be *literary*.

(Mr. Madden says fifty-seven,) a complaint certainly not likely to have been induced by the cause Mr. Madden is desirous of ascribing.

Tasso—the victim of multifarious misfortune—subject also to insanity, died of a violent fever, in his fifty-second year; and Thomson, who was remarkably indolent, and too much disposed to sensual indulgences, of a cold, caught on the Thames, in his forty-eighth year.

It is painful to us to drag the frailties of those eminent individuals from “their dread abode;” but to arrive at correct results it is absolutely requisite. They are, besides, matters of record, and sufficiently testify, that the views maintained by Mr. Madden are untenable, and that other causes than mere imagination were connected with their early fate.

Nor ought we to feel surprised that the productions of the imagination should be more largely furnished by those under forty years of age, than the more severe efforts of the judgment, which often require almost a life of application. Youth is proverbially the period of the imagination, and some of the best efforts of the poet have been made at a time of life when others are about to commence the prosecution of the transcendental studies of a physical nature; and, after the age of forty, we generally find that the ardour of the poet, and his productive powers, begin to fall off, so that the efforts of his muse are far between, and perhaps generally less dazzling than those exerted at an earlier age.

But Mr. Madden, as we have seen, is not always consistent, and has afforded ample room for censure and for satire from this cause. After going into a prolix description of the character of the incomparable genius, whose loss the world has been recently deploring, and still deplores, and mentioning that Sir Walter Scott died of palsy, he asserts, that this disease is the “too frequent termination of literary life!” and he enumerates amongst the “martyrs to literary glory,” Copernicus, Petrarch, Linnæus, Lord Clarendon, Rousseau, Marmontel, Richardson, Steele, Phillips, Harvey, Reid, Johnson, Porson, Dr. Wollaston and Scott—“a few of the many eminent names of those who have fallen victims to excessive mental application, by paralysis or apoplexy.” Yet many of these persons were not known as severe students; several are classed by Mr. Madden in the tables of literary occupations, not characterized by the higher flights of the imagination; some did not die of apoplexy or palsy; and most of them attained a good old age, although the habits of one, in particular, were such as would destroy any person who did not possess a constitution of iron. Copernicus, and Wollaston, and Linnæus, belong to the table of Natural Philosophers—“the first on the list of studies conducive to longevi-

ty;" the first of whom died in his seventy-first year, the second at the age of sixty-two; and the last at the age of seventy-two. Petrarch is in his list of poets. He attained the age of sixty-eight, and probably died of heart disease, for he was found dead early in the morning, with his head resting on a book. Clarendon and Rousseau died at the age of sixty-six: Marmontel in his seventy-seventh year: Richardson at seventy-one: Steele at fifty-eight: Harvey, the illustrious discoverer of the circulation of the blood, who is said to have *shortened* his life by a dose of opium, at eighty-one: Reid, the metaphysician, in his eighty-sixth year: Johnson in his seventy-fifth; and Porson, whose grossly intemperate habits were well calculated to shorten existence, at the age of forty-nine.

The above list of worthies is sufficient to show the longevous effects of literary pursuits, although they are said by our author to have fallen "victims" to "excessive mental application."

We suspect that in but few avocations could greater longevity be found; and there are but few in which the same number of cases of apoplexy or palsy might not be selected with facility. We shall indeed consider our lot happily cast, if our pursuits enable us to exist so long as Reid or Harvey, before we fall a "martyr to literary glory or any other."

It appears to us, then, sufficiently clear, that no such inferences as those of Mr. Madden can be deduced from his tables; and were the preceding remarks insufficient to establish this, and disregarded, we should consider the estimates contained in Table IV, calculated to stagger us, in which the average life of authors on "Revealed Religion" is stated as high as sixty-seven; whilst that of authors on Natural Religion—although the subjects are analogous—is not more than sixty-two. Poetry again, or as Mr. Madden restricts it—the art of versifying—affords an average of only fifty-seven; whilst the varieties of poetry that constitute sculpture and painting, are as high as seventy.

There is much more truth in the affirmation, that "the earlier the development of the mental faculties, the more speedy is the decay of the bodily powers."

"It is still the old proverb, with such prodigies—'So wise, so young, they say do ne'er live long.' Moore says, 'the five most remarkable instances of early authorship are those of Pope, Congreve, Churchill, Chatterton and Byron.' The first of these died in his fifty-sixth year; the second in his fifty-eighth; the third in his thirty-fourth; the sleepless boy committed suicide in his eighteenth, and Byron died in his thirty-seventh year."

But these are not cases to prove the insalubrious effects of precocious talents. Of the habits of Pope, Churchill and Byron, we have already spoken; and Chatterton, as Mr. Madden has himself observed, died from suicide.

He affirms further, that the early years of genius are not so often remarkable for precocity, as is commonly supposed; yet, as in many other cases, furnishes ample evidence to overthrow his own conclusions.

"Johnson is indeed of opinion, that the early years of distinguished men, when minutely traced, furnish evidence of the same vigour, or originality of mind, by which they are celebrated in after life. To a great many memorable instances this observation does not apply, but in the majority it unquestionably holds good; and especially in those instances in which the vigour which Johnson speaks of, displays itself in the development of a taste for general literature, and still more for philosophical inquiries.

"Scott's originality was early manifested as a story-teller, and not as a scholar: the twenty-fifth seat at the high school in Edinburgh was no uncommon place for him. Yet was the future writer of romance skilful in the invention and narration of 'tales of knight errantry, and battles, and enchantments!'

"Newton, according to his own account, was very inattentive to his studies, and low in his class, but was a great adept at kite-flying, with paper lanterns attached to them, to terrify the country people of a dark night with the appearance of comets; and when sent to market with the produce of his mother's farm, was apt to neglect his business, and to ruminate at an inn over the laws of Kepler.

"Bentham, we are told, was a remarkably forward youth, reading Rapsin's England at the age of three years, as an amusement; Telemachus, in French, at the age of seven; and at eight, the future patriarch of jurisprudence, it appears, was a proficient on the violin.

"Professor Lesley (Leslie), before his twelfth year, had such a talent for calculation and geometrical exercises, that when introduced to Professor Robison, and subsequently to Playfair, those gentlemen were struck with the extraordinary powers which he then displayed.

"Goethe, in childhood, exhibited a taste for the fine arts; and at the age of eight or nine wrote a short description of twelve Scriptural pictures.

"Franklin, unconsciously, formed the outline of his future character from the scanty materials of a tallow-chandler's library, and the bias which influenced his after career, he attributes to a perusal in childhood of Delves's Essay on Projections.

"All these, with the exception of Scott and Lesley, arrived to extreme old age; but there is nothing in the early indication of the ruling pursuit of their after lives, that was likely to exert an unfavourable influence on health. Those early pursuits were rather recreations than laborious exertions, and far different in their effects from those we have spoken of in the preceding instances of precocious talent."

Amongst those "instances" we find the name of Cowley, "who published a collection of his juvenile poems, called 'Poetical Blossoms' at sixteen, and died at sixty-nine." Yet Cowley, we have seen, as admitted by Mr. Madden, owed his death to his having drunk so deep, that he lay out in the fields all night, which gave rise to the fever that carried him off. Surely a death at the age of *sixty-nine*, and produced in this manner, is not a fortunate example in proof of Mr. Madden's position, that "the earlier the mental faculties are developed, the sooner the bodily powers begin to fail."

There is, however, much probability in favour of the last view of Mr. Madden's. When study is indulged to excess in early life, it has a tendency to induce a predominance in the nutrition of certain organs. It is well known, that if any organ be energetically exerted, its vital force becomes exalted, and a larger quantity of blood is directed towards it, so that it attains a greater degree of development than where it is less exercised. Hence we can conceive that a constant overstraining of the intellectual powers may occasion an augmented flow of blood to the brain, and lay the foundation to disease in that viscus, even in the adult. Still more likely is this to happen if the same application be made before the organs have undergone their full evolution; and hence we may conceive, that early and intense study may lay the foundation to faulty development in other parts of the frame, and to great energy of nutrition in the brain. But whilst we admit that this may be the case, we are satisfied it occurs but rarely, and doubtless far less frequently than is apprehended; the impaired health of the studious being generally referable to collateral circumstances rather than to cerebral disorder thus directly induced.

A recent writer* has hazarded the gratuitous opinion, that a high range of health is probably "incompatible with the most vigorous exertion of the mind, and that this last both requires and induces a standard of health somewhat below par."

"It would not be difficult," he adds, "to show, that the majority of those who have left behind them imperishable monuments of their intellectual powers and exertions, were people of weak bodily health. Virgil, Horace, Voltaire, Pope, and a thousand others, might be quoted in illustration."

Such impaired condition of the functions was certainly present in the cases alluded to, and it has existed, and does exist, in numerous others. But they are only coincidences, affording us, indeed, examples of high intellectual attainments and productions, in spite of the bodily infirmities under which those distinguished individuals laboured.

Nothing would appear to be clearer than that full intellectual development requires that the different corporeal functions should be faithfully and regularly exerted. It is impossible for the mind to aspire to lofty conceptions, or for the other intellectual faculties to be fully accomplished, unless the body be devoid of all suffering.

Whatever distracts the mind from its own operations, enfeebles the results; and nothing does this more effectually and unpropitiously than suffering of any kind. Every one must have

* DR. JAMES JOHNSON on "Change of Air," or the "Philosophy of Travelling."

felt the difficulty of bending the intellectual powers on any important topic, when the stomach has been deranged simply by overdistension; and still more, when food difficult of digestion has been taken; and how much more must this be the case under the continued pressure of functional organic disease! It can be easily conceived, however, that although sickness may interfere with the vigorous exercise of the "higher faculties," it may yet be the occasion of greater production than a state of health. Disease or infirm health necessarily confines the invalid, and hence incites to intellectual exercises, for the purpose of removing the *ennui* which such a condition necessarily induces, and thus the *production* may be greater, although the *capabilities* may be less.

We think, then, it is a general axiom—that literary pursuits are directly favourable to long life, whether they require the exercise of the memory, the judgment or the imagination; and that where the health is apparently injured by them, the evil is dependent rather upon collateral circumstances—irregularity of habits, as regards eating, drinking or sleeping—often acting upon a frame unusually susceptible of impressions, for such we have seen is the common accompaniment of genius, but not of poetical genius only, or chiefly, as Mr. Madden is desirous of establishing. And that these views are just is, we consider, strongly confirmed by examining the history of female authors, most of whom have been extremely long lived; doubtless, in a great degree, because they are exempt from that irregularity of life which we have seen to be so destructive to the poets whose productions have appeared in youth, and the celebrity arising from which has led them into society, and into habits that have but too frequently been most destructive.

In a late number of the *London Quarterly*, there is the following list of some of the most celebrated female authors of Britain. Their united ages amount to 1428 years, and the average to 71½, placing them next below the class of Natural Philosophers, as given by Mr. Madden.

<i>Names.</i>	<i>Age.</i>
Lady Russell,	87
Mrs. Rowe,	63
Lady M. W. Montague,	73
Mrs. Centlivre,	44
Lady Hervey,	70
Lady Suffolk,	79
Mrs. Sheridan,	47
Mrs. Cowley,	66
Mrs. Macaulay,	53
Mrs. Montague,	81
Mrs. Chapone,	75
Mrs. Lennox,	84

Mrs. Trimmer,	69
Mrs. Hamilton,	65
Mrs. Radcliffe,	60
Mrs. Barbauld,	83
Mrs. Delaney,	93
Mrs. Inchbald,	68
Mrs. Piozzi,	81
Mrs. Hannah More,	88

Total 1428

As one of the motives which Mr. Madden avows he had in view in writing this work, was "the opportunity which a literary subject of general interest afforded, of introducing here and there some medical observations, of sufficient importance to every literary person to deserve attention, though unfortunately of too little interest, in the form of a dry disquisition on a medical topic at any length, to engage it," we have taken up the subject in the same spirit, and endeavoured, by pointing at the sources of error in his facts and arguments, to arrive at the truth, and "to convey information of a medical kind, on many subjects connected with the infirmities of genius, without wearying the general reader."

On several topics of a professional nature, that are briefly touched on in the work before us, the author does not appear to possess any very distinct ideas, and where his meaning cannot be mistaken, it is frequently, we think, erroneous. In his chapter on "the last moments of men of genius," he attempts to elucidate "that brightening up of the mind previously to its dissolution," which is occasionally witnessed, but, according to our experience, far less frequently than is imagined. When this brilliancy of the flame prior to its total extinction occurs, it is probably dependent upon the temporary subsidence of the morbid and often painful activity of organs which had previously oppressed the functions of the brain, to which every painful impression must be conveyed. Under such circumstances, the brain may act, for a short period, as usual, or it may be even excited to unwonted activity, according to the character of the diseased actions directly or indirectly affecting it.

"Long forgotten pleasures (says Mr. Madden) are recalled, old familiar faces are seen in the mind's eye, and well-remembered friends are communed with, and the imaginative power of giving a real presence to the shadowy reproductions of memory is busily employed, and a sort of delirium, or rather of mental exultation, is the consequence, in which a rapid succession of ideas, in most instances apparently of an agreeable nature, pass through the mind, and the sense of bodily pain to all appearance is wholly overpowered."

This "rousing of the mind," Mr. Madden asserts, "is probably produced by the stimulus of dark venous blood circulating

through the arterial vessels of the brain, in consequence of the imperfect oxygenation of the blood in the lungs, whose delicate air-cells become impeded by the deposition of mucous on the surface, which there is not sufficient energy in the absorbents to remove; and hence arises the rattling of the throat which commonly precedes death." But this is, in our opinion, a very unsatisfactory mode of accounting for the phenomenon. It has been sufficiently established, that if the brain does not receive its supply of blood, duly oxygenized in the lungs, it ceases to execute its functions, and death of the brain may, in this way, be induced, and, in due sequence, the death of every part of the frame which receives its nerves from that organ. Is it probable, then, that the circulation of blood which has not experienced those changes, should be capable of affording a "stimulus" to the brain, to excite it to the more energetic performance of its functions? The idea appears to us preposterous.

In another chapter, the last but one, in which he refers to "a few of the many eminent names of those who have fallen victims to excessive mental application, by paralysis or palsy," we have the following remarks on the diseases of the nervous system, at a part of which the pathologist will be disposed to smile.

"Those maladies which arise from a disturbance of the nervous functions of the brain, have not only a common character, but in a great measure an intimate connection. Apoplexy and palsy, epilepsy and hysteria, hypochondria and mania, though they stand not in the relation of cause or effect, are at least modifications of disease, arising from a morbid condition of the nervous system, and generally connected with functional disorder in the digestive organs. The three distinguishing characters of epilepsy, apoplexy, and palsy, are convulsion, coma, and loss of voluntary motion.

"But all of these disorders are referred by medical writers to one common source, namely, pressure on the delicate substance of the brain, arising either from a fulness of the vessels of the head, or a rupture of them, but, at all events, to a plethoric state of the brain, either chronic, or acute and accidental. But we are strongly inclined to believe that this doctrine with respect to palsy, in the great majority of cases in which paralysis is the consequence of excessive mental application, is not only erroneous, but the treatment which is founded on it, worse than ineffectual—even highly injurious."

There is hardly a tyro in the profession who is not aware that epilepsy is usually treated as a disease by no means connected with a fulness of the vessels of the head, or a rupture, or a plethoric state of them; and that the best pathologists consider it to be so frequently dependent on debility and mobility of the nervous system, as to require the vigorous and regular use of mineral and other tonics in the intervals between the paroxysms; and whatever may be the difference amongst pathologists, regarding the condition of vessels at the moment of a paralytic seizure, there is none respecting the state of both

blood-vessels and nerves, when the palsy has existed for some time; and all admit that there may be, and frequently are, cases of paralytic seizure, where blood-letting cannot be practised, even when the physician is on the spot at the moment of the attack. All this has, however, to be determined by the physician, and no such rule can be laid down as that suggested by Mr. Madden, that the paralytic seizure, when it takes place in a literary character, "supervenes, in the great majority of cases, on the exhaustion of mind and body, and its conquest is over the ruins of a broken-down constitution; and so far from originating in a plethoric condition of the circulating system, *its origin, we believe, and every day's experience confirms the conviction, is an imperfect supply of blood to the brain, and an irregular distribution of it.*"

"Under such circumstances," he adds, "general blood-letting would certainly be an objectionable remedy—under all circumstances we fear that it is resorted to, at least on the onset, without discrimination and without advantage. No matter whether the patient is of a sanguineous or a saturnine temperament; of a vigorous or an enervated constitution; blood-letting, even to the abstraction of pounds of this vital fluid, is fearlessly recommended to be adopted in cases wherein the principle of vitality is already half extinguished.

"There may be indeed few cases of paralysis in which any mode of treatment has the power of preventing the recurrence of an attack eventually fatal. But we have seen many instances in which its recurrence has been prevented for a period of many years, and the patient, in the interval between the first and second seizure, left in the enjoyment of tolerable health, where the very opposite mode of treatment has been used; where the diffusible stimulants, and aromatic tonics, and aperients, had been exhibited from the commencement, combined with the strictest regularity of regimen, without abstemiousness, for even generous living is compatible with the rules of a well ordered regimen.

"From Mr. Savary, formerly of Bond street, we remember to have heard an account, eight or nine years ago, of a friend of his, a baronet, well known in the gay world, having been seized with paralysis, and finding himself, on his return from a convivial party, suddenly deprived of speech, and the power of moving one side of his body. Either from feelings of desperation, or an impulse of mental aberration, the gentleman had a bottle of port wine brought to his bedside, and having finished it, he turned with great composure on his side, and went to sleep. That gentleman is now living, his intellect wholly unimpaired, his speech restored, and his general health as good as it ever was; and he still daily discusses his bottle or two of port wine with apparent impunity.

"Few, we imagine, would have the folly or the recklessness of life which this gentleman exhibited, to think, under similar circumstances, of following his example; we would not recommend them; our only wonder is that in this instance it was not fatal. But, nevertheless, how can we reconcile the impunity with which this powerful stimulant was taken, at such a moment, with the notion of the malady arising from a plethoric condition of the cerebral vessels?"

The fact that palsy may occur, independently of any morbid fulness of the vessels of the head, is universally admitted. The singular circumstance is, that Mr. Madden should imagine he is

making any novel suggestion on the subject, except, indeed, when he affirms that the palsy, which supervenes on a life spent in literary pursuits, must necessarily be palsy of exhaustion or of acting—in which we affirm from experience he is decidedly in error. We meet with literary persons that are plethoric, and others that are of spare habit; and, in the same manner, we meet with paralysis preceded and accompanied by every sign of vascular turgescence and excitement, and paralysis of the atonic kind referred to by Mr. Madden; and it would be a grievous practical error were the physician to be guided, in his estimate of the propriety of practising or abstaining from depletion, by a simple knowledge of the degree to which the mental faculties had been exerted.

In the great improvements that have taken place in recent periods, as respects the discrimination of diseases, attention is paid to the kind of derangement going on in the suffering organ, and this is regarded as the basis for a rational system of medication, and this only.

We think, then, from all that has been said, that the pursuit of letters—whatever may be the intellectual faculties mainly exerted—does not necessarily induce infirmities of mind or body, except in the young, and in frames unusually impressible, as those of some men of genius are at times found to be; that the bodily ailments endured by literary persons, are apt to be induced by collateral circumstances, often necessarily attendant upon the pursuit; that the tendency of all literary occupations is to prolong life; that the exercise of no one faculty of the mind appears to produce more wear and tear of the economy than another; and that, in consequence, the tables formed by Mr. Madden, on inadequate data, and not always supported by the soundest and most unbiassed arguments, cannot be looked upon as *historical*, or in any manner settling the interesting question which he has agitated; but, on the contrary, as leaving the matter enveloped, to say the least of it, in uncertainty, or, as we would say, precisely in the condition in which he found it.

ART. IX.—*England and America—a comparison of the social and political state of both nations.* 2 vols. 8vo. London. 1833.

A Statement of the Principles and Objects of a Proposed National Society for the Cure and Prevention of Pauperism, by means of Systematic Colonization. 8vo. London. Published for the Provisional Committee. 1830.

To the first of these anonymous works the attention of our readers is directed. The title of the latter is added for reasons that will hereafter appear. To sit as umpire between nations is a high office, and it is perhaps prudent in him who aspires to it, to hold himself nameless—but if such a work of mediation between England and America is ever to come forth, it must be from another pen than this. Few, indeed, possess the requisite powers for such a task. In running over the scanty list of such English writers as we think were adequate to it, none strike us more prominently than the names of Southey and Mackintosh. Southey, to be sure, has his own prejudices; but they are honest and pure ones; the attachments of a contemplative, not a bigotted spirit; such as fortify the heart against vice, not such as blind the mind to truth. The pen that ended “*The Prospects of Society*,” and struck the moral balance between the age of Henry VIII. and George III. must be well fitted to undertake a comparison between countries whose relative condition, character, and prospects differ like those of distant ages. But in his case, what chance of that personal acquaintance with our country, without which all else is vague speculation?—we fear, none. The other is still farther removed from the task, for death has rendered that intercourse impossible which we once had reason to hope—the appointment of Sir J. Mackintosh as minister to this country in the year 1830 having been the current talk for some weeks in the ministerial circles, and his increasing infirmities understood to be the only impediment.

What such a work of arbitration in his hands would have been (had decorum permitted the publication of his opinions) can now be but matter of conjecture. It is pleasing, however, and perhaps not wholly unprofitable, to dwell upon the probable features of a picture drawn by such a hand. It would have partaken doubtless of his high and contemplative cast of mind, blending, in no small degree, as it looked upon our rising country, the past and the future, with the actual and the present; valuing things not solely for what they are, but also for what

they are producing. There would have breathed through it a calm philanthropic spirit; it would have recognized not only the equality of man, but the brotherhood of nations, and have prized the golden bond of a common faith and a common language, and all the better feelings of our nature, far above those conventional forms of society, which, to use his own words, "are but the frivolous work of polished idleness," but which, though always arbitrary and often false, are yet elevated by the narrow and unphilosophical mind into dividing lines of individual merit and national virtue. It would, in short, have been man speaking unto man—Christian unto Christian—the free subject of a limited monarchy to the free citizen of a regulated republic. Such would have been its tone;—no invidious comparisons; no sneering allusions; no contemptuous epithets; no satiric pictures, playful or malicious; no arrogant boastings under the garb of patriotism; no hostile challenges to be treasured up as pledges of defiance; would have disgraced its pages or rendered the talent of the writer a curse: but exhibiting, as it would have done, the existence in each country beyond, perhaps, any other nation on earth, of religious principles, social virtues, and domestic charities, of all that tends to advance man's well being here, or secure it hereafter, the faith that strengthens his heart, and the hopes that purify it—with all these arguments of amity urged in that common mother-tongue, of which he was so profound a master, he would, if not have "bound the hearts of the people as one man," at any rate have taught them to hold cheap all such on either side of the Atlantic, who, by making minor differences the ground of offensive censure, make them at the same time materials of future national discord.

These are the traits we miss in the popular English tourists; it is not that their statements are wholly false, or their intentions always unfriendly—but their views have been narrow and their reasonings fallacious. Broad conclusions from slender premises have turned even truth into slander, while arbitrary rules of judgment have made all their reasoning, however logical, end in fallacy. These are defects arising from the want of that philosophic spirit without which the mind, whatever be its talents, is in slavery to the power of habit and external circumstances. Hence it is that they proceed with such total disregard of our national and social independence, our common rights, as intellectual and moral beings, to mould our own institutions and manners in reference to our own wants; they proceed, we say, to summon us, for our supposed social delinquencies, before a petty court which can have no jurisdiction in the case, and try and condemn us by laws, local at least, if not arbitrary, and liable themselves to revision in a higher judicature. Now, it is from this *statute* law we appeal—we appeal to that

common law of moral and civilized man to which all are equally amenable, and which can be the only arbiter among nations, in courtesies as well as rights; this alone is the jurisdiction we acknowledge—"vera lex, summa ratio, naturæ congruens"—"the same to-day and to-morrow, at Rome and at Athens, and which neither senate nor people can abrogate," therefore it is we need some citizen of the world, some mind that philosophy has elevated and philanthropy enlarged, to draw the picture.

But there is still another error into which these writers fall. The estimate of nations, like that of individuals, is one of movement, as well as position; it is not merely the amount, but the fluxion of that amount that is to be looked at; it is the increment or decrement of wealth and enjoyment, on which human happiness mainly depends. As the beggar who lives to be a prince, and the prince who lives to be a beggar, may have each passed through precisely the same scenes, eaten the same dinners and expended the same amount of money in the course of their lives, and yet the difference between their enjoyment of life has been immense—so it is with nations; the advancing stage of society is full of happiness, the present day is happy because it exceeds the past—the morrow is still happier by its bright prospects. Such a nation wears, it may be said, one universal smile of gladness, for to it belong the vigour, and the hopes, and the fresh enjoyments of youth: such is America. Now to the receding stage of society belongs an opposite picture, and even long before that fatal change arrive from flood to ebb of fortune, while nations are still struggling in the fulness of their strength against an overhanging destiny, the dark future begins to throw its shadows over the present; the misery of the lowest class boils up from below; throughout the middling classes reigns one pervading spirit of anxiety and distrust; and even over the banquet of the wealthy and the noble may hang that suspended sword which darkens the feast and scares away the appetite.

How far this is the present picture of England, her own writers may tell. Our only position now is that the ability to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of these opposing stages of society, is essential to a just estimate of the two countries, and that the skill to hold that balance even, is of a higher philosophy than has hitherto fallen to the share of English tourists in America. Certain it is we find it not in the anonymous author before us; but this with him is a venial fault—for we arraign him on a graver charge. Others may have written without the requisite ability, in ignorance or in prejudice, to please a party or advance a name; the present writer is probably the first upon whom rests the baser stigma of a covert personal interest in his argument, and we consequently charge upon him in round terms, the unworthy motive and the base attempt to palm upon the American

public, by means of a popular title, a worn out scheme of private interest as if it were a new measure of national conciliation. These, indeed, are grave charges, and therefore not lightly made; we intend, before we have done, fully to substantiate them, even at the risk of leaving ourselves but little room for the examination of certain economical positions of our author, in which trick and error are singularly blended by a powerful yet prejudiced pen, and the interest of our country in them most preposterously concluded.

This is a labour so little attractive that we certainly should not, knowingly, have taken it upon ourselves; but the title of the book misled us; and having once entered upon its perusal, we felt bound to speak our opinion, more especially as we happened to have private documentary evidence bearing upon its history. The author's statement, that the work is intended to be published in this country, made it, besides, a call of duty on some one guardian of our native press, to instruct beforehand the American public in the true character and real objects of a work whose title alone would be a sufficient passport to a wide circulation.

"England and America" is, in truth, a great misnomer. The true title of the work is that which we have taken the liberty to annex in the heading of our article, being the one under which the substance of the argument was originally brought forth in England, viz. "A statement of the principles and objects of a proposed Colonization Society, for the cure and prevention of *Pauperism*, by means of systematic colonization." Of this pamphlet, which was also anonymous, the present work may be termed a republication, with additions and modifications—the additions being generally so irrelevant as to be obviously but a blind to the real question, while the modifications are such merely as were needful for the new application of an old argument,—but let the author himself tell his disinterested intentions. The work opens with the following Preface:

"The following pages are intended for publication in America as well as in England. They have been written with two objects in particular: first, to lay before Americans a sketch of the political condition of England, and before the English an explanation of some peculiarities in the social state of America; secondly, to point at the means of removing those causes which are productive of great evils to both countries.

"For the satisfactory performance of such a work, powers are required which the author does not possess; command of language, a style calculated to engage the reader, and a name which should give to every statement or suggestion the weight of authority. But, on the other hand, he has had peculiar motives for examining the condition of America, and is so far partly qualified to treat upon that subject; he believes also that he is enabled to make Americans comprehend the state of England, which hitherto has been described to them only by Englishmen writing, not for America, but for England. The English and Americans know very little

of each other's affairs. Now, the present writer has looked at America with English eyes, and at England with American eyes. It was a consciousness of this advantage that prompted him to undertake the task of describing to each nation the chief social peculiarities of the other.

"Another advantage which the writer fancies that he possesses over many Englishmen and Americans who might have written on these subjects, is the want of any patriotic prejudice in favour of either country—of any motive for concealing or perverting the truth. His opinions, he believes, have been formed and are stated without affection or fear. Plain-speaking must nearly always be disagreeable to somebody; and in this case it will offend many, because large classes, both in England and America, are mentioned without any regard for their selfish interests, their mean passions, or even their honest prejudices."

Now, with such a preamble, who would believe that the author of this work has never "looked at America" at all—never set foot upon her shores—is a stranger alike to the country, the people, and the spirit of our institutions—that "the peculiar motives" to which he alludes are merely the interested views of a company of land speculators—that the object of his work is neither comparison nor conciliation, but merely to pave the way for a profitable job to an English colonization society,—still more, that the foisting in of the name "America" at all, was altogether an after-thought, arising out of defeated expectations in another quarter; and that, in short, the United States in this argument is but a "*pis aller*," after the superior claims of Australia and Botany Bay to profit by the transportation of English paupers—the value of whose labour to our country he so absurdly estimates as to imagine that the government of the United States will be willing to pay for their transportation, while the English Colonization Society stands ready behind the curtain to proffer its aid so soon as the argument shall have produced its effect. Now, all this, though far from being apparent from the work itself—we yet hesitate not to say is its sum and substance. A couple of extracts, apparently unconnected, will serve to introduce the narrative and incidental proof which led to the identification of the two works whose titles we have already given—after which will naturally follow the more circumstantial evidence afforded by the present work, of the truth of the charges above made.

"If the Congress of America were to raise the price of waste land" to that *upset* price, as it is afterwards termed, &c.—(vol. ii. p. 175.)

"Mr. Wilmot Horton, jealous it would seem of any interference with a subject, part of which had employed his thoughts for some years, became a member of the (Colonization) Society, and then broke it up by getting into the chair at a public meeting, and zealously condemning the objects of those with whom he professed to unite himself."—(vol. ii. p. 160.)

The phraseology of the first passage, and the fact recorded

in the last, recalled to our memory an incident which, told in the third person, runs as follows:—An American traveller being in London on Wednesday 17th June, 1830, was invited by the above named Mr. now Sir R. W. Horton, to attend the meeting of the provisional committee of a society about to be formed for the transportation of British paupers, under the title of the "National Colonization Society." He attended accordingly, though at a late hour; found Mr. H. in the chair, and the whole in confusion; the members debating with great warmth in the committee room, while the public meeting was convening without, the very fundamental principle upon which the society itself was to be established. In the dearth of argument the stranger was appealed to as umpire, and the following question, after several modifications, submitted to him. "Supposing that the Congress of America were to raise the present upset price of waste land to three times its present amount, what would be the result upon the character of the new settlement?" To this he replied naturally and truly, there would be no settlement, inasmuch as no land would be sold by the government, since settlers could buy it cheaper from other holders. The question was then amended—"supposing the government had the monopoly of waste land, &c." the answer then was—the monopoly price would check settlement and prove injurious to the country, by putting an arbitrary limit on the first element of profitable industry. The question was then asked, "would it not so elevate the value of land already occupied as to enable it to pay rent?" The answer was—it would doubtless have that tendency, but that such rent would be obviously but a tyrannical transfer to the pockets of the landholder, and not only so, but an actual diminution in the whole amount, inasmuch as labour would be withheld, by the very terms of the supposition, from the most productive soils. This conclusion, however, did not seem displeasing to the majority, one of whom (a native of Ireland, to judge by his tone) presented to our countryman a pamphlet containing, as he stated, the principles and object of their benevolent association. The traveller then took his leave, and on meeting Mr. H. soon afterwards, learned from him that the meeting had broken up in confusion—the whole having been an interested scheme to give a national character to a private speculation and put money into the pockets of certain gentlemen, embarked in an Australian colony, by persuading the public that a high price of land was essential to the success of the settlement. With this double view, two pamphlets had been prepared—one for the Knowing ones, entitled "Sketch of a Proposal for Colonizing Australia," printed and circulated but not sold—the other sold and widely circulated, under the more popular title of "The

National Colonization Society," being the same with that prefixed to our article.

These events being thus recalled to mind, excited the suspicion that the two works with whose titles we commenced might reflect mutual light upon each other. The "Statement" was accordingly rummaged up—compared with its present high-sounding associate, and found to be in argument and substance, as we have already mentioned, perfectly identical; written obviously by the same pen, and prepared for the same object; greatly enlarged, it is true, but with no other alteration in the argument than would of course be needful in substituting the name of America for that of Australia, and proving that to be true of the United States which the former Statement required to be proved of the convict colonies of that southern continent.

But there are some intervening links yet to be traced in this chain of literary fraud; some further transformations of this pliant argument, before it was finally moulded into its present shape of an international scheme to instruct "England and America," in their common interests. Within a few months after the failure of the National Society, it came forth in a new garb, viz.—"Proposal to his majesty's government for founding a colony on the south coast of Australia," printed and circulated, but not sold, in 1831. This was quickly followed by a published work, giving the "Plan" of the Company. The object of this application was to obtain from government a proprietary charter of lands in South Australia, between degrees of longitude 132 and 141—extending northward to latitude 20°, including Kangaroo and other islands on the coast; being six hundred miles in one direction and unlimited in the other; with a view to colonizing on the principle of a monopoly price of land, by means of which, as the Company argued, the settlement would be greatly improved, or, as all others argued, the proprietors would certainly be enriched. For the history of the correspondence that ensued with government—the excited hopes and final failure of those interested—we refer our readers to Appendix No. 3, at the end of the 2d volume—and assure them that they will there find the secret of the present work, which we are fully satisfied would never have appeared—certainly not as addressed to Americans, and under its present imposing title—had their own government proved less impracticable. The field of operations they then missed in Australia, they are now willing to seek in America. A new movement was therefore to be made; they had lost ground at home and gained none abroad; their motives had been exposed by Mr. Horton, and their plans defeated by the government; so that their only resource was to shift their position, reverse their battery, and new form their argument; and having failed to per-

suade the old country that it was worth their while to pay the Colonization Society to rid them of their surplus population—now to try their success in persuading the new country that it was worth their while to pay for receiving them. Such is the history of this “*crambe bis recocta*,” which has been thus skilfully dished up to suit the American palate out of the crumbs and leavings of a stale Australian pasty. Whatever may be thought of the preparation, the praise of ingenuity cannot be denied to the “artist,” but to self-interest no transformation is difficult. ’Tis true, the original argument was addressed to England, exhibiting the national blessing involved in freeing her from the curse of a pauper population; but then, how easy to reverse the order, and exhibit to America the national blessing involved in the acquisition of so much additional labour. The original “Statement” had, it is true, expressly asserted the comparative inapplicability of the Plan to our western world; but still, that was but comparative, and afforded no reason why, when Australia was withheld from them, America should still be rejected. The grounds of that earlier rejection may amuse the reader.

“The Canadas, says he, (for the United States was not then in his eye,) might be made as rich as the inhabitants of the state of New York, but not richer: they might, perhaps, soon become as numerous as the citizens of the United States, but they could not become more civilized: they might be able to purchase as many of the products of British industry as the Americans would purchase, if their tariff and our corn laws were repealed, but not more; they might, in one word, become a more than half civilized, instead of remaining for generations to come, a more than half savage people. Can there be a better illustration of the admirable effects of the measure in question in those colonies, where it might be adopted without any check from the impolicy of neighbouring states?”—(p. 64.)

Can there be a better illustration, we feel inclined to add, of the admirable effects of a writer speculating in ignorance? What baseless (we had nearly written *base*) visions of Australian prosperity must have been present to the mind of the writer, when he sought to turn thither the current of emigration by affecting to despise the wealth, population and commercial prosperity of the United States as far inferior to what might be there anticipated! But such language was to be no longer held—the occasion which demanded it had passed by—minor points too required correction. Mr. Horton had been spoken of as a gentleman, “through whose zealous exertions philosophers and statesmen had acknowledged the importance of the question,” (Statement, p. 66,)—but he had exposed their motives and refuted their arguments. He was now therefore to be sneered at as “a member of parliament, a privy counsellor and a tory.”—(vol. i. p. 45.) “His majesty’s government” had been in the pamphlet treated with all due respect.—(p. 64.) It had now

forfeited all claim to confidence, and is accordingly stigmatized throughout the present work as "vile boroughmongering." The old constitution (*i. e.* before the reform bill) is pictured as a system of jobs—"victualling jobs, slopping jobs, scrip jobs, building jobs, harbour, road, bridge and canal jobs, and other jobs of the same class without end." "Now observe," says our author, "if the whole of what was stolen from the public by means of all these jobs had been spent honestly in the public service, the constitution would have wanted the zealous support of a great band of robbers, delighted with the present and fearful of change. Really the old constitution is to be admired more for its roguery than its profusion."—(vol. i. p. 148, 149.) Nor is the Whig ministry much better treated, since Lord Howick, "who in parliament thought fit to acknowledge the services of the Colonization Society," yet eventually declined granting the charter which Lord Goderich had before refused. "Who formed this mongrel government? Who bestowed the power of legislation upon too many for an oligarchy, too few for a democracy," &c.—(vol. i. p. 184.)

All these alterations were no doubt easy and natural to a Utilitarian reasoner, keeping a steady eye on the main chance; but how to bring the argument to bear upon the government of the United States, and make them a party to a scheme for colonizing English paupers? This required a little more management. In the first place, the people were to be propitiated by a few complimentary phrases, which, as the previous "Statement" was not to be published nor yet "circulated" here—might not be known on this side the water to be utterly at variance with what was therein contained;—for instance:

Statement.

"At the best, a poor people like the United States Americans."—(p. 24.)

"He (the American settler) passes much of his time in drinking, smoking and hunting; he becomes a half savage."—(p. 35.)

England and America.

"This (the United States) appears to be the happiest state of society consistent with the institution of property."—(vol. i. p. 131.)

"In America, profits and wages both are high. All the capital employed in America yields high profits and high wages," &c.—(vol. i. p. 120.)

The argument, however, was yet to come, and that was not without its difficulties. The original question was one of British colonization for British benefit—it was now to be converted into one of American colonization for American benefit. The two points the author had to gain were, 1. To show that the United States were included under the term colonies; and, 2. To render palatable the doctrine that they were to be indebted for their civilization to the importation of British paupers. The first he accomplishes by an arbitrary definition, though in direct

contradiction to the language of the "Statement." In that earlier work, the idea of the United States being colonies, to receive the benefit, seems not to have entered his mind; on the contrary, he expressly asserts them to be colonizers, italicising the word in order to mark the contrast, "the most extensive *colonizers* (in the strict and proper sense of the word) that ever existed."—(p. 4.)

But the argument now required them to be *colonies* and not *colonizers*. His language therefore is "a society which continually receives bodies of people from distant places, and sends out bodies of people to settle permanently in new places, is the idea which will be expressed whenever the term colony is used here; the idea of a society at once immigrating and emigrating, such as the United States of America and the English settlements in Canada, South Africa and Australia."—(vol. ii. p. 74.) Verily definition is a convenient logic. Having thus taken up his position, the United States cannot retreat. They are *colonies*, and whatever has been or may be proved of colonies is by consequence demonstratively true of them. "Independent states! which are the independent states that could produce very cheap corn for the English market? The United States, truly; but the United States are as much colonies as were the never dependant colonies of Greece."—(vol. ii. p. 93.) "It follows that colonies situated like the United States, have a greater interest in obtaining labour than capital from old countries."—(vol. ii. p. 110.) After describing our country, he triumphantly asks, "But is not this a description of a colony according to the sense in which the term is here used? A country having room for more people, with more room at hand for the greatest increase of people." Certainly; and so would England be proved to be an alms-house, had the definition been assumed—a country with more mouths than it can feed—and the one definition has as good claim to be received as the other; yet still the definition bears him out. "The United States are still colonies, according to the sense in which the word is used here."—(vol. ii. p. 109.) And now comes the conclusion from this condition: "Whether the colony be dependant or *independent*, all that the government of the mother country has to do at home for promoting colonization, is to take care that the poorer class at home be well informed of the advantages of going to a colony, &c."—(vol. ii. p. 223.)

But the hardest part of the task still remained. The United States being colonies, brought them, it is true, within the scope of his reasoning; but the basis of that reasoning being that all colonies ran into barbarism, unless supported by an immigration of labour from the old country, the horn of the dilemma upon which he was necessarily brought, was the proof that the United States

had fallen into that condition, and upon such conviction being satisfactorily brought home to them, then to proffer to their acceptance the only sufficient remedy, viz. the annual importation of some 100,000 labourers from England and Ireland. To this end he arrives, accompanied with the unequivocal proposition that the annual proceeds of the public lands should be appropriated to pay the expenses of their passage, and with frequent incidental hints at the facilities that might be given to such an arrangement through the medium of the *English Colonization Society*, of which company of speculators we, in our turn, would more than hint that the author of *England and America* was an early, and continues to be a leading member.

Now this, we hesitate not to assert, is the sum and substance and scope and aim of this high-sounding, falsely named national work, "*England and America*;" and we defy even its author to say that we have done either injury to his motive, or injustice to his argument. That he did not expect to be thus compared "himself with himself," we can readily imagine; and had his work been addressed merely to his countrymen, we might have been content to admire in silence the adroitness with which he could transform his pliant argument into every varying form of present expediency; but when he states distinctly "it is intended for publication in America," repeatedly addressing himself to his American readers as those most deeply interested, we have felt it a duty we owe to our country and to ourselves to give this narrative of its secret history and real objects, and to expose (despite the talent and science of the author, which certainly are not to be despised,) the ignorance, the folly, the presumption, and the base motive of the whole of his present argument as applied to the United States—its ignorance as to the real condition of our country—its folly in supposing our social condition to be dependant upon the alternative of domestic slavery, or the importation of British labour—its presumption in daring to urge upon an independent nation the adoption of a plan which is professedly based upon the acknowledgment of their own degradation; and though last, not least, that base motive of covert gain which, whatever be the merit of the argument, is damnatory of him who urges it.

Colonization is, indeed, an operation all important for England; and how rightly to order it, is a high and worthy question for the solution of her economists and practical statesmen. She is labouring under a plethoric fulness of men and money, which have ceased to be to her the sinews of strength, or the sources of wealth, for want of an adequate field for their development. Now this can be found only in new colonies. We concur fully, therefore, with our author in his sense of their importance, nor do we in the least dissent from his position, that the experiments hitherto

made by that government have been unsuccessful because unskilful; nor are we altogether at variance with him in the principle on which he proposes them to be founded; but our quarrel with him is, that he drags the United States into a question which relates only to Great Britain and her own colonies, necessarily villifying our condition by the terms of the argument; and that this he does in much culpable ignorance, with much illiberal prejudice, and with too strong indications of an unworthy motive, lurking beneath a scientific argument and philanthropic professions, for his reasonings to be received as conclusive. This is our quarrel, and we proceed to make good our plea by a few instances of the truth of the charges now made against him.

The following, taken at random from his first volume, may be received as a specimen of his knowledge of our country, and the condition of the people. To his statements we append facts.

"No part of the population of America is exclusively agricultural, excepting slaves and their employers."—(p. 21.)

Fact. Three-fourths are so.

"There are fewer people to the square mile than when the population was about a quarter of its present amount."—(p. 331.)

Fact. Taking the state of New York, for instance, in the year 1790, it had three to the square mile; it now has forty; Kentucky, the latest formed state at that period, then had two, it now has sixteen to the square mile.

"The grand result of the superiority of English agriculture is, that whilst in America probably three-quarters of the people are employed in agriculture, more than two-thirds it is believed of the people of England are fed by the agricultural industry of less than one third."—(p. 30.)

Fact. England rarely feeds herself, while the United States, or America, as he loosely terms us, after feeding herself, exports of the produce of her agriculture to the value of \$50,000,000 annually.

One of the four "most remarkable facts" adduced by him of the peculiar skill of England, is the amount of its paper notes, "which, though they circulate with much greater ease than silver or gold, cost next to nothing."—(p. 36.)

Fact. To our sorrow we understand the manufacture of paper notes full as well, indeed rather better than the English.

"Any where in America a farming capital of \$5000 would return a profit of fifteen per cent."—(p. 84.)

Fact. This will be good news for the Atlantic states farmers, whose profits do not average the one half.

"In America, universal suffrage promises to establish universal freedom of postage."—(p. 202.)

Fact. This is the first we have heard of it; though we con-

fess the recent heavy loans of the Post Office Department look something like a preparation for it.

"In fact, the greatest trade in America is that of land jobbing, by which more fortunes have been made than by any other; a trade in which three out of four Americans engage at some period of their lives, either singly or in company."—(p. 217.)

Fact. Land jobbing is a small trade, few fortunes are made by it; not one in four, perhaps in ten, of our population engage in it.

"During the last war between America and England, American husbandmen found no difficulty in turning their hands to all sorts of manufacturing employments."—(p. 241.)

Fact. The necessity of having skilled workmen from Europe, was, on the contrary, the greatest difficulty under which our manufacturers then laboured.

"Why is it that serfs in Poland, and slaves in America, produce cheaper corn than freemen any where?"—(p. 246.)

Fact. Our cheapest corn is raised by freemen, not by slaves.

"An Anglo American company, willing to speculate on the establishment of market places for free trade with the Chinese, would not be rebuffed at Washington."—(p. 308.)

Fact. A mass of blunders and absurdity, as to the nature, powers and interests of our government; and, as if to render his ignorance more palpable, he goes on to add, "At Washington, New York, Boston, Baltimore or Philadelphia, what follows may be read with interest."

What does follow with the author, is an extract from some parliamentary evidence, tending to show, what every American trader knew before, that the Chinese are a people not averse to commerce. With us, what follows is, that our author is profoundly ignorant about America; since his stringing together such incongruous interests as his list of our cities indicates, with an *or* between to take his chance of all, makes it clear that it was a random hit, without the slightest knowledge of facts in the case.

On the subject of slavery, his opinions, it must be acknowledged, are novel: "The original and permanent cause of slavery in America is superabundance of good land."—(vol. ii. p. 36.)

The facts of our history, so obviously opposed to this conclusion, he makes short work with. "The states of New England, in which negro slavery was never permitted, form no exception to the general rule." "Though the puritans and the followers of Penn, who founded the colonies of New England (!) flourished with superabundance of land and without negro slaves,

they did not flourish without slavery." "They were led to carry on an extensive traffic with white men and children, who, kidnapped in Europe, were virtually sold to those fastidious colonists, and treated by them as slaves."—(pp. 22, 23.) This treachery towards poor emigrants, it seems, is still continued. "The supplies of labour obtained by the late immigration of poor Germans into the United States; poor Germans, who, ignorant of the laws and manners of America, were liable to be held in a state of bondage, &c."—(p. 184.) It is due however to the author to state, that this last charge he has considerably modified, out of tenderness no doubt to our feelings, in the work to be republished among us, compared with his previous "Statement" at home. It there stands thus (p. 10.) speaking of "the great number of poor Germans conveyed to the northern states of America during the late war," he says "these foreign bondsmen were in point of fact not indented labourers but temporary *slaves*. Their total ignorance of the laws and even of the language of America, placed them at the mercy of their masters, and very often but little mercy was shown to them."* The data of his calculations sometimes too require correction, to an extent not very likely to gain confidence in his conclusions; thus, what is stated in the "Statement," (p. 11.) as "9000 emigrants," is in the latter work multiplied to "20,000."—(vol. ii. p. 210.)

But on the subject of slavery he is inconsistent. Having proved it to be superabundance of fertile soil, he afterwards shifts his ground and maintains "want of free labour is the cause of slavery in America; not the dearth of labour, but the want of free labour at any price."—(vol. ii. p. 112.)

But from whatever cause arising, it is all important to the civilization of America until superseded by importation of labour. He has had the prudence, it is true, to leave out his earlier query, (Statement, p. 37.) "What might Washington and Jefferson have been, if their fathers had not been slave owners? a sort of wild men of the woods!" but still he does not hesitate to assert that with slaves alone is any "combination of labour and capital possible in America."—(vol. ii. 57.) And that "exchangeable commodities have never been raised to any extent except by the labour of slaves."—(vol. ii. p. 28.)

His scheme for the extinction of slavery in the United States we recommend to our Abolition Societies. It is as follows:—

* Since writing the above, we find our commendation misbestowed. Vol. ii. p. 24, he repeats his stronger statement:—"During the last war between England and America, vast numbers of poor Germans were *decoyed* to those states which forbid slavery, and there sold for long terms of years to the highest bidder, by public auction."

"Considering that the Americans pay 3,600,000*l.* a year, (being the interest on the value of the whole stock,) for the increase of slave labour, and that the English pay about the same sum for the maintenance of idle paupers, might not these two sums, making together 7,200,000*l.*, be so employed in conveying to America the surplus (*i. e.* the pauper) labour of England, that, before very long, free labour should be substituted for slave labour in America? Supposing the cost of passage from England to America to be 10*l.*, the yearly expenditure of 7,200,000*l.*; in this way, would take from England to America 720,000 labourers every year; about twelve times as many as the yearly increase of American slaves. In three years the number of labourers so taken to America would be 160,000 more than the whole number of American slaves. In three years, then, it might be supposed, this great amount of immigration would extinguish slavery in America by the substitution of free labour."—(vol. ii. 39.)

What is to be done with the two millions of slaves who are thus superseded, he has not thought fit to mention; from his silence we presume that they are to share the fate of their condition and "be extinguished." But a new difficulty arises against this hopeful scheme. "These 2,160,000 labourers, (paupers it is to be remembered,) taken to America, might all of them, and would most of them, cease to be labourers for hire soon (!) after landing in the new country; they would become independent land-owners, competitors with American capitalists in the market of labour, and buyers of slaves."—(p. 40.) This would, of course, as he justly observes, "render the abolition of slavery in America still more difficult." The true remedy however now develops itself, "The sale of new land (by the government), yields near £ 700,000 (\$3,000,000) a year. That amount of revenue is employed for the general purposes of the government. If it were employed in conducting pauper emigration from Europe, it would convey every year to the United States 80,000 persons of the labouring class, more than the yearly increase of slaves. If the price for new land were raised, so as to prevent those labourers from becoming independent land-owners until others had followed to take their place; if the fund obtained by the sale of new land should thus become greater every year, and should always be employed in fetching labour from Europe, then might free labour take the place of slave labour; then might the owners of slaves and of land set free their slaves without loss; then might slavery be abolished without injury to any one, with the greatest benefit to all."—(vol. ii. pp. 45, 46.) Which of our readers, after this, will doubt the propriety of our proposed alteration of the title of the work, and that instead of "England and America," it should read "Plan for removing British paupers, by means of systematic colonization." That some interested scheme lies at the bottom of the argument is apparent from its whole history; its reasonings have evidently been from the first but a plea for profit; its science (such as it is) but a cover for speculation;

its roots were nourished in the rank soil of avarice; in England, its native country, it grew up with that stigma and sunk eventually under that reproach; and the fruits it now proffers to America, as the fresh gatherings of philanthropy, are such as have been already blown upon and blasted at home. This we say is evident from the most casual examination. It was a scheme double-faced in its origin; to the initiated, a money making plan; to the public, a disinterested charity. Even in the latter form, however, so rank was the motive, that it out-topped concealment.

The first article of "the National Colonization Society," laid down by the proposers of it, was as follows.—(Statement, pp. 69, 70.)

"That His Majesty's government be requested to aid the objects of the Society, by requiring a payment in money for all future grants of land, and by paying to the Society out of the proceeds of sales, a fixed sum for every young couple which the Society shall convey to the colony free of cost." That is, they were to have the monopoly of the emigration job, be paid for it not in *land*, but in *money*; and this they call conveying them "free of cost." Nor was this all. The fourth article proposes that until such emigration-fund be formed, "the Society undertake to provide a free passage to those *orphan and destitute children* of both sexes, for whose emigration parishes in England and societies or individuals in Scotland and Ireland may be willing to pay at the rate of for each person; and that such orphan and destitute children be apprenticed to settlers in the colonies;" that is, the Society shall be paid for their transport and have their services afterwards, which, according to their own showing, may be valued at one shilling per week on an average of four years, and this they call "providing a free passage to *orphan and destitute children*." Well indeed may they italicise the words: but it seems they were to have the value of their name at least at home, as well as abroad. The next article runs thus: "That the Society endeavour to obtain subscriptions and donations, to be applied to the emigration of *orphan and destitute children* and to the general purposes of the Society." This speaks for itself; their last article is at least equally conclusive, "That as more than one society, acting independently of each other, would raise the price of freights by means of competition, &c." We quote the preamble merely for its maintenance of the false economical position, that competition among carriers would enhance the price of freights; a position too obviously false to be attributed to any thing but that "*auri sacra fames*," which sometimes closes the avenues to the understanding, as well as those to the heart. Of this multifarious association, this may certainly be regarded as its *grub*

state, while it was still covered with the slime out of which it had crawled to light.

In its *secondary* state, viz. that of an application to the government for a proprietary charter in Australia, there was certainly less of the mire about it, but still it was "of the earth earthy." Men of name and character had indeed joined in the application, nominally at least; of such, doubtless, the views were honourable, and we would speak respectfully; nay, perhaps "so were they all, all honourable men;" but still we cannot help suspecting there was something more meant than meets the ear, in the final objection of Lord Goderich to granting their petition, viz. "that the company would be the receivers of large sums of the public money, for the due application of which they do not propose to give any security."—(Appendix, No. 3.) What adds to our suspicion is the running commentary, appended by our author, to this official document, which is marked by precisely such a tone as we would beforehand expect from the mixed feelings of rage and disappointment which such a suspicion would awaken in minds capable of exposing themselves to the charge. A few specimens will be sufficient not only to prove this, but, we think, to awaken a corresponding suspicion in America, at finding such strange matter in a work purporting to be one of national conciliation.

Letter. "Lord Goderich has entered on the inquiry with a full conviction, that nothing which has hitherto occurred can be supposed by the parties more immediately concerned to preclude his majesty's government from their free and unfettered discretion on the general principles and the particular details of the scheme."

Comment. "That is, translating these fine gilt-paper terms into plain English, all which had gone before, was to be counted for nothing. From the tone of the government, after Mr. Hay became its organ, one should be led to suppose that these petitioners, instead of asking for a piece of parchment, had been requesting Mr. Hay and Lord Goderich to emigrate along with them."—(Appendix, iii. p. 335.)

Letter.—The result "would be to erect in the British monarchy a government firmly republican."

Comment.—"If the company should revive their project, they would do well to put a House of Lords into it; with a Baron Blackswan, a Viscount Kangaroo, a Marquis of Morrumbidgee, and a Bishop of Ornithoryncus."—(p. 338.)

The letter closes with these words, "His Majesty's government could not recommend to Parliament a measure so entirely subversive, in one part of His Majesty's dominions, of those royal prerogatives which, for the common benefit of all his subjects, it is His Majesty's duty to maintain."

Upon which the expressive comment is "fudge,"—and thus ended their hopes of an Australian empire. Now, without taking sides in this question, we may at least ask our author why this

rage? whence this contemptuous tone towards one of the highest functionaries of government, and in reference to a grave official document? And as one of those American readers to whom he so specially addresses himself, we may be pardoned the suspicion that such unscientific heat betrays some nearer motive than love of truth. To this conclusion we have indeed come; and despite the gaudy wings of the painted butterfly which has now issued forth to flatter our sight, we cannot but suspect, after tracing it to such an origin, that its progeny, like its parentage, will prove to be a creeping and voracious worm. But we can assure him he mistakes his ground. To be receivers of public money without giving account, is as little likely to be acceptable in America as in England, and "fudge" will turn out as poor security at Washington as it has proved to be in London.

After this deadly rebuff, the only signs of vitality displayed by the association were in an occasional lecture on the subject of their claims and their grievances, and a published letter now and then from, or purporting to be from, some settler in Australia, recommending to his countrymen at home the principles and the patronage of the Society. But some things are too vivacious to die, and it is a law of animated nature, that the lower the *class* the more tenacious it is found to be of life; so has it proved here; the reptile was "scotched, not killed," and now having cast its slough, it has come forth in such fresh and bright colours, that it disdains all its former kindred. "England and America" is, in truth, a philanthropic title, and "social evils" in the one country and "scarcity of labour" in the other, are fine sounding scientific terms for the swarm of paupers which England would gladly get rid of, and as gladly persuade America to receive. But the plan goes further: we are not only to take, but pay for them; we are not only to receive them when brought to our shores, but actually to send for them, or rather (to take from us the little profit of employing our own shipping in the business) we are to employ the Colonization Society of England to transport them hither at our expense. Now, we do not say all this is openly stated "totidem verbis;"—that would be too monstrous a proposition to be laid before us with any chance of success;—but we do say, it may be fully gathered from the perusal of the present work, more especially with a little reflected light from the author's previous "Statement." And we further assert, that all the matter the work contains extraneous to this argument, has been added but as a blind. Indeed, so foreign and unconnected is it, that our author has found himself obliged to apologize, in the Preface, for the apparent incoherence of his subjects; and with a strange attachment to at least verbal truth, to give the title of *notes* to that which constitutes the *text*, while he throws into the form of notes, the substance and aim of

his argument; that is, the history and the claims of the Colonization Society. A slight but not meaningless change in the style of that Society, deserves also to be noted. It is no longer the National Colonization Society; that indicated that they looked only to the interests of England; the term national is now dropped, and though philanthropic is not substituted, it is yet plainly argued, and the patronage of "the Colonization Society," pre-supposed by the whole course of reasoning, to be the interest of America even more than of England. Taught, however, by former experience, the claims of the Society stand, as we have already said, in the back ground, and patronage is but casually mentioned, and rather left to be necessarily concluded than formally stated. Our readers, however, may judge for themselves how far the cloven-foot is hidden: in addition to the extract already given as to the remedy for slavery, take the following:

"This plan would be very easily carried into effect." "The Americans do actually raise by the sale of waste land near £700,000 a year. What could be more easy than for the United States to spend this income in fetching labour to America? We have only to suppose that Congress should choose to do this, and we suppose the plan of the English *Colonization Society* carried into effect without any sort of difficulty."—(vol. ii. p. 189.)

"For example (only for example mind), if the United States should propose to lay out £1,400,000 a year in bringing young couples from Ireland, this would produce a demand for 100,000 Irish couple, &c."—(vol. ii. p. 210.)

To the obvious objection that such increase would cause a glut of labour, he has ready his scientific answer, that gluts arise from the circumstance that the supply is not constant and regular. "Now by the plan of the Colonization Society, the supply of labour must be constant and regular,"—(p. 192), and he therefore concludes there can be no glut—with about as much reason as it might be concluded that the cure of a surfeit was to be a regular daily debauch. The following stock-jobbing scheme we confess not fully to understand. "Suppose that the Americans, having resolved to dispose of their fund obtained by the sale of waste land in bringing labour to the United States, should, with a view to the extinction of slavery, with a view to obtaining immediately a sufficient supply of free labour, be willing to anticipate that fund, to borrow money on that security, could a better security for overflowing English capital be readily imagined?"—(p. 232.) The amount of it seems to be, that the Colonization Society will be content, instead of cash payment, with the security of the government, guaranteed by the land.

The following is more intelligible—(vol. ii. p. 190), "Pursuing this case for the sake of more ready illustration, (only illustration, but why would not "Canada" have done as well?)

the disposal of this fund in this way would bring to the United States in the first year 100,000 labourers. But as the income which the United States obtain by the sale of waste land has been steadily increasing for years, along with the increase of births and emigration, so would that fund increase much more rapidly, if each year's income were employed in bringing to the United States people who must, otherwise, have remained at home!"—the latter clause being, we presume, a delicate periphrasis for people vulgarly termed "paupers." Of the principle itself he seems never to entertain a doubt—the only question is as to the means, "Whatever course it would be best for the United States to pursue for drawing people from England to America, &c."—(p. 121), and not only so, but as might be presumed, the particular mode suggested turns out as faultless as the principle on which it was founded. His final conclusion is, "It seems hard to overrate the advantages within reach of the United States by means of colonizing their waste territory in the way proposed."—(vol. ii. p. 213.)

Of the moral and patriotic virtues in a population he takes but little count, nor yet of the obvious danger of introducing by such pauper immigration into a young and comparatively pure country, the vices and crimes of an older society,—all this passes with him for nothing; the people are to be *numbered*, not *weighed*, and 100,000 Irish labourers are, consequently, as great a blessing to our country, the moment they reach our shores, as an equal number of the hardy, industrious, and sober sons of the descendants of the Pilgrims. Entertaining, as we do, a very different view, we cannot agree with him in congratulating our country on the prospect he presents, nor unite with him in facilitating the operation. Believing, on the other hand, that the spring of our prosperity issues from the virtues of our people, we are infinitely more anxious to add to their moral than their physical strength, and with that view would much rather erect a barrier than build a bridge, as suggested by him, for the facilitation of foreign paupers into our hitherto happy, virtuous, and united country; yea, we repeat it—happy, and virtuous, and united country; and, should our author, in reply, cast in our teeth our recent divisions, and our present gloomy prospects, we shall thank him for reminding us of the strongest argument against the plan he advocates; for the schemes of mad ambition which now threaten our land, find the roots of their strength in that very population which he seeks to introduce; in the unwise facility with which we have admitted foreigners and paupers to all the rights of native citizens; rights which, if we had guarded with but half the jealous care they deserved, would still have sustained us in paths from which we now fear we have forever wandered—in the pure and safe footsteps of Washington, of Hamilton, and of Jay.

Let us awaken in time, and recognizing the source whence our present dangers issue, limit at least, if we cannot stop, this desolating flood. Forewarned too of this insidious proffer of national fraternity, let us close at least our ballot-boxes, if not our ports, against this threatened tenfold immigration of the starving, the vicious and the restless population of Europe. Untrained to the discipline of self-government, political power runs riot in their hands—let them not then be trusted with it—let it be reserved for them as a boon, when experience shall have enabled them to use it wisely, or, what were still better, for their native children after them.

But we wander from our author; with regard to his work, we think we have made good our assertions; we know we have not either mistated or overrated his opinions. In the arrangement of his materials, he has certainly shown some tact, at least in concealing his real object, and, as he doubtless thinks also, in preparing for it a favourable hearing. Of the Colonization Society we learn nothing, until the middle of his second volume; while the most of its affairs are thrown into the very Appendix. Of the first volume, on the contrary, the greater part is taken up with defamation of his native country, and his own government, which doubtless he imagines to be acceptable here; while, to add to the compliment, America is spoken of as happy, pure and prosperous. In this propitiatory strain it is, after giving an exaggerated picture of the sufficiently heavy social evils of England, that he exclaims: "This, Americans, you whose domestic manners an Englishwoman holds up to the ridicule of her countrywomen; this is a faithful sketch from domestic life amongst the English middle class."—(vol. i. p. 105.) Again, "Charity, virtue, happiness, these are English words still, but the meaning of them seems to have settled in America. I wonder that emigration is not more the fashion, and wish that Mrs. Trollope would write a book on the domestic manners of the English."—(p. 78.)

Two impolitic expressions, however, touching America, even here escape him, which, as inconsistent with his design, we would consequently note as a defect to be amended; the wit seems to have been too strong for policy. "Messrs. Thompson and Fearon, who, being rich, are highly respectable, keep the largest gin shop in England—in the world. It is situated (I mention this as a guide to Americans visiting London,) on Holborn Hill, near to Saffron Hill; a quarter in which Irish wages prevail and pawn-brokers abound. Here gin is served by young women dressed up like the *belle limonadière* of a Paris coffee-house, and the establishment in all its parts is nearly as fine as *Véry's*, or the *Café de Paris*."—(p. 60.) The other relates to the expiration of the English East India

charter; a matter to which, with profound ignorance, he assigns as great an influence over our commerce, as if we had been bound under its monopoly. "The English Hong, says he, is at an end. Be alive, Jonathan! Your smug-pigeon with the China-man is in danger."—(p. 294.)

We have already noted the strange pertinacity with which he adheres to this absurd idea; devoting to it above one-fourth of a volume. These two last extracts, however, are given with another view, and that is, to mark the real tone of his feelings towards our country, viz. those of scornful bitterness, which is so strong, that even the needful policy of his argument cannot wholly restrain its expression.

But it is time to look at him in that light in which he professes to appear—namely, that of an arbiter between England and America. Our anatomy of his real character has, however, left us but little space for this (to him) secondary character, (to us) secondary labour. With the state of England he is no doubt familiarly acquainted; *well* we can hardly say, for he is evidently more prejudiced than knowing; he writes, however, with a strong and graphic pen, though still with a dash of that vulgar slang which, while it adds somewhat to the spirit of a picture, diminishes at least as much the authority of the likeness. But his style has another feature, to us still more offensive; we mean the tone of light, callous indifference with which he details the wretchedness and vice, the anxieties and sorrows of his native land. No word of sorrowing sympathy, or generous ardour, or love of country, or Christian philanthropy escapes his lips; from all which, we cannot but judge him to be one of those degenerate sons of Britain, who take pleasure in proclaiming her infirmities, and who turn traitor to their parent at the very moment when she stands most in want of the kind words of affectionate children.

What secret cause of complaint our author may have with his country, beyond the refusal of the solicited charter in Australia, we profess not to know; but this we do know, that no true lover of his country could feel as he evidently does, thus to write; or write as he has done, feeling as he might touching the land that gave him birth, and in the hour of its need, throw the weight of his talents into the scale of her downward fate. If he think by such base argument to win his way to favour in this rival land, he may take his answer in the indignation and scorn it has excited in at least one genuine American bosom. "Dispersion," we can assure him, has not yet so far weakened in America those genuine English virtues of honour and love of truth, which are, as it were, the inheritance and heir-loom of all who speak the language of Shakspeare, of Hooker, and of Milton, that we should be willing to receive his dark drawn pictures as either

just or generous: generous none can think them, and just few will believe them—certainly no intelligent American who has visited his ancestral home, for he has recognized there what he was familiar with here, domestic virtues and Christian faith, and all the kind benevolences of life, casting sweet sunshine on their chequered landscape, and redeeming, with bright hopes, what until then he was less familiar with, the dark shadows which ignorance and suffering humanity cast over the land, and the still darker clouds of a restless, turbulent, infidel philosophy.

The good and the educated are not, therefore, as our author would imply, an evanescent quantity on either side of the Atlantic. It is the noisy scribbler alone who thus delineates them; whereas, we believe that could all this bitter froth and scum be blown aside, we should see the virtuous and the reflecting to form not only the heart and the head of either community, but the main trunk of the body politic; and we find comfort in appealing to their mutual sentiments of respect and amity, when our hearts are sickened with the passion and prejudice and base motives and bye-ends of such works as "*England and America.*"

Of America how little he knows must be already apparent, and even of that little, much is made wrong, by being twisted to the support of a mercenary scheme. Were it not for this dominant motive always guiding the course of his argument, and bringing it round to the same conclusion, from whatever quarter it sets out, it would be utterly incredible how he should read in all points of our condition, whether intellectual, moral, or political, but one cause for all our evils, and but one remedy for that misleading cause. That all-pervading cause is "dispersion," arising from the low price of land, while that sole remedy, "*unica et sola spes*" is the "immigration of foreign labour," or, "to translate," as he elsewhere observes, "these fine gilt paper terms into plain English," it comes to this, the application by Congress of the \$3,000,000 received last year, to put the English Colonization Society in funds to transport to our shores 100,000 British paupers; raising, at the same time, the price of the land, in order that next year there may be more dollars for the Colonization Society to receive, and more paupers for America to entertain; and so on, each element happily reacting on the other, the dollars and the paupers being alternately cause and effect, until both elements shall be exhausted, that is, until Congress has no more land to sell, and, consequently, no more dollars to pay out; or until Europe have no more paupers or criminals to transport; or, to mention a third element, which would probably be the last exhausted, until the Colonization Society shall be tired with their profitable monopoly. Some of the original members would, no doubt, be found retiring upon

their Australian titles; but the race would doubtless be kept up; others would soon come in, and the places of "Baron Blackswan" "Viscount Kangaroo" and "Marquis of Morrumbidgee" be supplied by no doubt equally worthy incumbents.—Whether our author would be one of the first or last to retire to "otium cum dignitate;" and when he did, what title he would select, can be but matter of conjecture; certain we are, it would not be as "Bishop of Ornithoryncus," since we judge, from a casual expression, he is no friend to the clergy, nor yet to the church! "The hypocrites" says he,—*"the hypocrites established schools on the Lancasterian plan, vowing that one of themselves, a Dr. Bell, had brought the system of mutual instruction from India. In their schools, however, which they called national, they added note and comment to the Bible; that is, they taught the church of England catechism, which makes slavishness the first duty of man. But this device of the aristocratic clergy was of no avail."*—(vol. i. p. 159.)

It is easier, however, to tell what our author dislikes than what he approves; and perhaps by a skilful "system of exclusions and rejections," according to the Baconian logic, we might arrive at a shrewd guess almost at the individual himself. Let us try. He vilifies the clergy, the aristocracy and the government; therefore he is not of them: he hates the Tories and he despises the Whigs; therefore he is not of them. Of the latter he says, the nation "has squeezed all the good out of them;" therefore he is of that party who used the Whigs as their tool. Of all forms of government, he likes that best which prevailed recently in England upon the temporary resignation of Lord Grey, when "for ten days, England was governed by newspapers and political unions. It was not an interregnum as some have said, but a good strong government, orderly too, and like that of the United States, a government which gave immediate effect to the public will."—(vol. i. p. 180.) This excludes him, to say the least, from "conservatives" of all denomination. Now, of all forms of doctrine held by these new conservatives, the Utilitarian alone is praised. Of all societies formed by Utilitarians, the Australian or Colonization Society alone is commended to public patronage. Of all the Utilitarian schemers remaining, as Falstaff says, "unhanged in England," but three are mentioned with approbation; one of these is dead, bearing our author's eulogium of "one of the wisest and best of mankind;" and he is proud to add, that to him he is indebted "for suggesting the form of his present treatise." "The form," he says, honestly—as the substance had long before been laid before the public. But we have now approached near enough; there remains only "*par nobile fratrium*," and whether "the greatest happiness principle" would

permit the identification of the author with either, that is, him who receives, with him who bestows, the praise, we must leave to those who are more conversant than we are with this new code of morals; we would only add, that in taste and temper, as well as talent, the present work strongly reminds us of the pages of the Utilitarian periodical, of which one of them is editor. But this inquiry has withdrawn us from the subject on which we were entering. It is truly amusing to mark how the phantom of "Dispersion," haunts our author wherever he goes:

"In short, and long, and round, and square,
"Tis Johnny, Johnny, every where."

Is it a question about the fact of religious revivals in our country? "Dispersion" settles the question. He thus argues the matter:

"Most English travellers in America hurt their credit for veracity, by describing instances of the most violent religious frenzy." In England, many people do not believe Mrs. Trollope's story of the "anxious benches." I do, not doubting either, but satisfied that throughout the less populous parts of the Union, people often meet together for the express purpose of working themselves into a state of superstitious madness. To overrate the crazy doings of a camp-meeting in the backwoods, would be impossible. Bodies writhing, arms swinging, legs dancing, eyes rolling, groans, shouts, howls and shrieks: men knocking their own heads against trees, and women tearing the clothes off each other's backs; the congregation frantic with fear of the devil, and the preacher drunk with his own gibberish; it is all true, and of common occurrence."—(vol. i. p. 314.) Having thus settled a question of evidence, by his own gratuitous "not doubting," he proceeds to explain why it must be so. It is because "above two-thirds of the inhabitants of America pass the greater part of their lives in solitude." "In such spots, men pass weeks together without exchanging two ideas. Women months or even years without forming one." "A wandering preacher, therefore, in America, does not create, but only supplies a demand for his services; visiting thinly peopled districts, not with a view to delude the scattered inhabitants, but because he knows that they already long for his presence; that they are waiting for a dose of superstitious terror; and that if he should not help them to devil worship, they would send for some other dealer in that, to them, intoxicating drug."—(pp. 320, 321.) Now, setting aside the exaggeration and infidel slang of the above quotation, how, we would ask, is the charge of "dispersion" being the cause, consistent with his own statement, that "scenes have been lately acted at Exeter Hall, (we would add also the Caledonia chapel,) in London,

exhibitions of furious religious bigotry (and folly), such as it would be impossible to get up in America." The fanaticism of such "revivals," we do not deny; but we say it is of every age, country and condition; and that its wildest scenes have ever been acted in crowded cities, of which the metropolis of England has had its full share.

Again, "Americans (says he) are accused of presumption, conceit, and gross national vanity. Allowing for exceptions in the more populous parts of the Union, and especially in the great sea-port towns, the people of America may, in this respect, be likened to the Tartar conquerors of China, who, being themselves barbarous, consider all but themselves barbarians." "Some Creoles of New South Wales, visiting England, thought London a miserable place, when compared with Sydney." "This narrowness of mind, arising from ignorance, seems proper to the barbarous conquerors of China; but, in colonies planted by the most civilized nations, it is a degenerate sentiment—a step backward from civilization to barbarism." "In such cases, the ignorance which promotes conceit and mean pride, is a result of 'dispersion.' The original cause of it in America being, not democracy, Captain Hall, but the low price of new land."—(pp. 325, 326.) But here the same difficulty meets us as before; the theory may solve our case, but what shall we do with others, still more marked, where the same causes do not exist; for China, it is true, (where the opposite of dispersion exists,) he tries to make a salvo, by laying the fault upon nature; but what shall we do with the "dogmatism and conceit," for instance, of Captain Hall, or Hamilton, or even of the author before us, who probably has never been beyond "the sound of Bow Bell;" and who certainly lives in a country where, according to his own showing, the population is sufficiently crowded, and land sufficiently dear. We would counsel him, therefore, in his American edition of the work, either to amend his theory or else account for such anomalous exceptions. But this is a privilege he always claims, of making facts bend to theory. The only thing he never questions, is the truth of his hypothesis. He proves his facts by his theory, and then his theory follows necessarily from his facts. "Why have the Americans degenerated in learning? Why do they set a lower value on knowledge than the colonists in Franklin's time?"—(p. 328.) To the solution of which unproved phenomenon, he brings in an assertion as wide of the truth as the wonder it is brought to solve, viz. because we are "a more dispersed society than the colonists of Franklin's time."—(p. 330.)

Again, "The curiosity of the Americans is not a vulgar trick, nor, as some will have it, a fruit of democratic government, but a result natural and inevitable of a faulty mode of colonization,

in which no thought was ever taken to keep a due proportion between people and land.”—(p. 324.) We are sorry again to suggest those practical inconsistencies which in our author’s opinion are obviously of such light importance; but may it not be considered as a difficulty that this curiosity is most proverbial of that state (Connecticut) which, alone, of all the colonies, was settled on the principles which he recommends; in which “dispersion,” comparatively speaking, never existed, and which at the present moment is, in its population, the most concentrated of the Union, and in its ratio of inhabitants to the square mile, equal even to some of the old states of Europe. We confess that such incongruities do somewhat stagger us with regard to the whole theory: nor is it only moral questions which are thus solved. The tariff, condemned by our author on economical principles, is approved by him on social ones, because “it counteracts in some degree the barbarizing influence of dispersion, and for that most useful quality is well worth some economical sacrifice, if there be any.”—(vol. ii. p. 52.)

Of slavery, too, as we have already seen, it is “the original and permanent cause.” Well then may our author exclaim, as he pathetically does, in concluding the melancholy list, “Evils, resulting from the very low price of waste land, meet one at every turn in America.”—(p. 57.)

But there is evidently something faulty in this logic: it proves too much; let us try it after our author’s example in the form of a syllogism.

The facility of getting fertile land is the great evil of colonies:

But this evil is most fully avoided where there is no fertile land.

Therefore, countries without fertile land are the most favourable for the plantation of colonies.

Or thus:

Dispersion has been, from the first, the cause of all the social evils of America.

But had there been no more habitable land than the colonists first occupied, there could have been no dispersion.

Therefore, had all beyond their gardens been desert, we should have heard nothing of the social evils of America.

But as this last has caught us with a conclusion we cannot wholly deny, we pass to another point. Had the speculations of our author come before us in a less questionable shape, we should have taken pleasure in seriously examining his positions and supplying any lack of local information in the application of them to our country; this we would have done, had we believed truth, disinterested truth, to have been his object; but

as it is, the want of that moral basis has degraded his work from the dignity of science, and entitles it to little other attention than would be bestowed on the well-drawn plea of a sharper. The honest man may be the less skilful arguer of the two, but he terminates the discussion on simpler grounds than a Q. E. D., and shuts the door in the face of the logician. This, however, we are not willing altogether to do, inasmuch as we will not confound men, whom we know to be honourable, and who have hastily given the sanction of their names to the Colonization Society, with a hack advocate, whose labours tend only to disgrace them.

We shall conclude our remarks, therefore, with a short notice of the few points on which his whole argument rests—at the best but doubtful positions, the greater part unquestionably false.

The first, upon which as a corner-stone his theory is built, is thus laid down by him:—"A history of colonization would show, that all new colonies, having a vast territory at their disposal, have prospered or languished, according as the governments by which they were founded took care, or neglected, to dispose of the land to be colonized with a view to combination of power amongst the colonists."—(vol. i. p. 38.) Meaning by the last phrase, as he afterwards explains, "preventing dispersion by means of a high price of land."

Now, whatever truth there may be in particular instances, as a universal fact we deny this position, and appeal to our own country as conclusive proof, where it is certain no such care was ever taken, and where the prosperity has unquestionably exceeded all former example of colonization. Whatever, therefore, be the tendency of this principle in itself, it is borne down in practice by other more operating causes, as for instance, by the moral, intellectual and social character of the colonists themselves, and the care exercised by them in the institution of laws, schools and religion, for those who come after them; to any one of which features (certainly to all combined), might be much more justly attributed that deciding influence, which our author so dogmatically confers on a comparatively unimportant circumstance. Thus, to take his own case—that New York is superior to Canada, even when divided but by a line, it is not to be explained, as he asserts, in the fact that land is *given away* in Canada, but *sold* in the state of New York; but it is to a mass of operating causes, some of which are natural, as soil, climate and access to markets; some political, as more attractive forms of government, leading to a more contented condition of the people; but chiefly, as already hinted, moral; resulting in that tone of character formed by early education and habit, which tends to cast out the idle and licentious from

the land, or to change and convert them by the power of public opinion.

Misled too by his theory, he greatly overrates the importance of our Congressional land system. Whether the price of waste land be fixed at one or two dollars the acre, is with him the hinging point of our national prosperity; while we ourselves know it to be an insignificant item in our policy, altogether unfelt by the country.

He is equally, too, in error as to its influence in checking the dispersion of settlements. Up to the present time, about one hundred and fifty millions of acres have been surveyed; of these but twenty millions have been sold, widely scattered throughout the whole extent. Eighty millions are now in the market ready for entry at the minimum price, and thirty millions more are subject to be proclaimed for sale whenever there shall be a demand; so that "the band," to use his own phrase, is not very tight.

According to our author, again, it is not "fertility" but "locality" which gives value to land; if so, how happens it, we would ask, that fifteen millions of acres of uncultivated wastes, capable of improvement, lie unoccupied within the compass of the British islands; nearly four millions in England itself? Why does not locality give them value? evidently, because fertility is a still more essential element: both indeed must concur;—how far each is to be taken into account, is a matter not of science, but of calculation—a problem, therefore, that can never be better solved than by the free choice of the settlers themselves, who are to enjoy the profit or bear the loss.

There are few points, indeed, on which there can be greater security for individual discretion. No man goes into the wilderness from preference—profit is his rule, and if he go farther from a market, it is because he has balanced crop against freight, investment against investment, and found, according to the old adage, that "the longest way round was the shortest way home."

We think, therefore, that our author is in error in the very starting point of his argument, and that in his ignorance of the practical operation of things in new countries, he is carried still farther away from the truth, and arrives at a conclusion, in which no intelligent American, at least, will be found to join him.

That the present inhabitants of the United States have degenerated from the civilization of their forefathers, and that further degradation can be checked only by an ample encouragement to the immigration of foreign labour, meaning, of paupers, is a conclusion of which we know not whether most to admire,

the arrogance or the folly. The arrogance which dictated it we despair to cure him of; to the proofs of its folly he may still be accessible. We would ask him,—If this be such a desirable and vivifying population, on what ground he supposes it is that our state legislatures and city authorities are continually devising ways and means to check its influx and to modify the evils resulting from it. It is simply, we would tell him, because experience has proved the reverse of his position, and that the benefit of their labour is, we find, too dearly bought at the price of so much idleness and thriftlessness, so much misery and vice as they entail upon the community; the majority of them come to us, not only without capital, but without skill, without economy, without industry, and too often without principle—since among them are necessarily many already hardened in vice and ready for all villainy. If our author doubt this, let him look at the records of our state prisons, jails and penitentiaries, and compare the native with the foreign inmates; let him visit the alms-houses and hospitals of our larger seaports, and estimate if he can the amount of wretchedness and misery such importation has brought upon our shores, and we are then ready to put it to himself to say what we should think of the knowledge, the modesty, we might almost add the sanity of an author, who gravely proposes that we should not only receive them but pay for them, not only in their present, but incalculably greater numbers, and this upon the avowed reason that it is essential to maintain the moral and intellectual civilization of our land!

A few facts which we have taken the trouble to verify, will serve to show him that our general statement is not exaggerated.

In the city of New York, the following abstracts have been obtained, illustrative of the comparative amount of poverty and crime, as existing among native Americans, that is, from all parts of the United States, and foreigners:

	<i>Total.</i>		<i>Foreigners.</i>	
Penitentiary,	593	-	203	over one-third.
Alms-house, (adults,)	1355	-	969	over two-thirds.
(children,)	772	-	579	over two-thirds.
Bellevue Hospital, (sick,)	238	-	170	over two-thirds.
(maniac,)	177	-	101	near two-thirds.
City Hospital, (1833,)	1983	-	908	near one-half.
(actual state,)	2034	-	1000	near one-half.
House of Refuge, (1833,)	121	-	72	three-fifths.
(actual state,)	174	-	100	three-fifths.
City Dispensary,				
Male in-door patients,	1126	-	563	one-half.

Female do.	do.	1670	-	917	near three-fifths.
Male out-door	do.	5555	-	3666	over three-fifths.
Female do.	do.	7875	-	4748	over three-fifths.

Of the out door relief, bestowed by the city authorities, it is estimated by the visiters that eight out of ten are foreigners, and the same proportion may be fairly assumed for individual charity.

The total number of emigrant arrivals, at the port of New York, was, in

1828,	-	-	-	-	-	19,023.
1829,	-	-	-	-	-	16,164.
1830,	-	-	-	-	-	30,224.
1831,	-	-	-	-	-	31,739.

Such is the antiseptic population which the emigration of labour furnishes to us. Even without the labours of the Colonization Society we have enough—enough to make every native American reflect in sad and sober earnest, whether the time be not come to impose a remedy of another sort, and guard at least, our political institutions from such rude and unhallowed hands, as even now begin to dictate in our elections. Our native citizens, trained up in freedom, know how to enjoy it, while the ignorant and prejudiced of foreign lands, are alike alien to our equal institutions, and hostile to their sober spirit. Hence the calm and moderate tone which marked the earlier periods of our government; and hence too much of that fatal change which has already begun to work among us so much evil. The spirit of mad misrule grows not in America; it is a plant of foreign growth; it is a flame lighted from a foreign torch, and nourished and fed by no native fuel. Greatly to controul immigration is against the spirit of our free institutions, as well as, probably, beyond their power; but we doubtless can, and as surely ought, to neutralize the evils which flow from it, by withholding the right of citizenship, from a foreign population, obviously unfit for its sober and discreet exercise. We are, of ourselves, a quiet, peaceful people, and for ages might continue ignorant of war and violence, were it not that we are to be thus annually inoculated with matter fresh from the out-breaking boils of Europe. Even while we write, our heart is saddened with the news of contending armies of foreign labourers, on the canals, shedding blood like water; and still more with the successful violence of a rabble led on by a foreigner, at a recent meeting in a neighbouring city, of ten thousand peaceful citizens, assembled to deliberate on a subject of momentous importance. These are bodings of future convulsion in our hitherto peaceful land, which it is painful yet needful to contemplate, for their source is obvious, and their

remedy as plain; and as high a test, in our opinion, of patriotism is now calling up, as was in 1776—for as well might rational liberty sink under foreign domination, as be overwhelmed by the licentious torrent of foreign immigration.

Of such a catastrophe the danger is greater than most of us are aware,—setting aside the plottings of the English Colonization Society. To make us parties to our own undoing—the flood of foreign vice and pauperism is rising silently upon us from other quarters; new facilities are daily furnished to emigration abroad, while the old barriers which have hitherto tended to restrain it here, are gradually giving way and breaking down among these threatened changes. We allude particularly to a case now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, touching the constitutionality of a law of the state of New York, commonly termed “the Passenger Law,” by the provisions of which ship owners have hitherto been bound to enter into bonds for all pauper passengers, that they should not within two years become chargeable to the state. Now, this law, it is understood, will be this winter set aside as unconstitutional, and thus a tax equivalent on an average to a dollar and a half per head be removed from the business of the importation of subjects for the alms-house and the penitentiary.* How far this bounty will operate upon the extension of the trade may easily be conjectured. Among other indications of its increase, we would mention the provisions of a placarded advertisement that

* ILLUSTRATION. “*City of New York. Common Council. Board of Assistants. Monday Evening, Feb. 24.* In the absence of the President, Mr. Labagh was called to the chair. The usual communication of approval was read and ordered on file.

A special communication was received from the mayor, touching a suit commenced in 1830, against George Miln & Co. for refusing to give the usual security on landing foreign steerage passengers—which suit has been taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, has been argued, and the Justices being divided in opinion, has been ordered to a new argument at the next term. The communication states a number of important facts concerning the importation of paupers, &c.; among others, that it has become common in England to untenant the poor-houses of their paupers, and send them to New York at the expense of the parish from which they come; and that the same has been done in France: that common felons, highway robbers, and burglars, have actually been sent from Hamburgh by the public officers there, as appears by the statement of the American consul. The effects of such measures are manifest. The communication urges strongly that a correspondence be opened with the other Atlantic cities (Baltimore having already commenced it), requesting their co-operation in petitioning Congress to pass a proper law in relation to the subject. The communication was referred to the law committee.”

recently caught our eye in the streets, entitled, "Emigrant Passage Office, (Liverpool and New York,) for steerage passengers from England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales,"—and which from the circumstance of it being styled a "Company," and its vessels, provisions, &c. being stated to be under the supervision of "Lieutenant Lowe of the royal navy, appointed by the British government," appears to bear something of an official character, and for aught we know, may be the initiatory proceedings of the "Colonization Society" itself. Among its provisions the following is a bounty offered for Irish paupers:

"The company, at their own expense, pay the passage of such persons as may embark from DUBLIN, BELFAST, CORK, WATERFORD, LONDONDERRY, SLIGO, NEWRY, DUNDALK, and WARREN'S POINT, by way of Liverpool, in the steamboats."

What operation this may have upon the starving population of Ireland, may readily be foreseen. What upon that of America seems to have been with its authors a matter of suspicious doubt, as we may judge from the penal precaution appended to the advertisement.

"N. B. A reward of \$20 will be paid upon the conviction of any person found engaged in tearing down or defacing these bills."

With "England and America" we have done. Its minor claims upon our notice, whether of serious condemnation or contempt, sink before the absorbing questions of national interest which it has brought up before us; and we would trust that the question once excited, might not sink and be forgotten with the transitory cause that has given it birth. In parting with our author, we might say we are sorry we cannot do it in those terms of respect which we would have used, had we read in his work any of those traits of character which excite respect; but we have not: talent, indeed, there is enough, and to spare, but unmarked by that benevolence of heart which makes it amiable, or those higher principles which make it honourable and useful. Of his own country he speaks with bitter malignity, of ours with open scorn. He is no patriot; he is no philanthropist; and his Utilitarian views reach not beyond "the thews and sinews" of our mortal mould; material nature is all he sees, physical strength all he values. That man has a heart to feel, and a head to think, and a spirit to reach after better things, are truths that come not within his philosophy; and this alone would be sufficient to unfit him from sitting as a judge of the social blessings or the social evils of society—all which so evidently flow mainly from man's spiritual nature; but further, he stands, at least before that American public, a disgraced man, one who has attempted to palm upon them a British scheme, under false pretences; to clothe with a veil of science the plans of private cupidity; one who with the words of

peace and conciliation on his lips, seeks entrance to our country that he may vilify and upbraid us; one who sows dissension under the banner of concord, and in the name of "England and America" labours to infuse into the hearts of both, feelings of mutual disgust, contempt, and aversion. On such writers would we gladly set the stamp of infamy.

We close then as we began. Oh for the pen of a Southey or a Mackintosh, pure-hearted, lofty-minded, and well-instructed, to banish forever from the field of international courtesy, these unworthy occupants—to open to both nations the as yet sealed volume of their national character, that they might therein read their indelible claims to mutual respect and mutual sympathy. Called to the high destiny of standing foremost among the nations of the earth, in the race of moral improvement and Christian knowledge, each with its own high duties to perform, and appointed trials to undergo, and peculiar dangers to run, what thoughtful, generous spirit, on either side of the Atlantic, but must be willing to say to the other, "*Esto perpetua.*"